DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 569 EA 005 031

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Ironside, Roderick A. |
| TITLE | A Process Evaluation: The Fall 1972 Follow-up. A Supplement to the 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools. |
| INSTITUTION | Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | ETS-PR-73-3 |
| PUB DATE | Feb 73 |
| CONTRACT | OEC-0-71-3705 |
| NOTE | 64p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Case Studies; Curriculum Development; *Elementary Schools; *Formative Evaluation; Individualized Instruction; Individualized Programs; Instructional Innovation; *Multiunit Schools; *National Surveys; *School Surveys; Surveys |
| IDENTIFIERS | IGE; *Individually Guided Education; Multiunit School Organization; MUSE |

ABSTRACT

The followup study reported here is a supplement to the process evaluation of the 1971-72 multiunit school organization/individually guided education (MUSE/IGE) nationwide installation effort by the Wisconsin Research and Development Center. The major purpose of the followup study was to determine basic implementation status in a number of schools -- at about the midpoint of the second year of the overall installation program -- using selected criteria related to both MUSE and IGE programing. In all, 98 schools were chosen for the followup phase, including (a) the sample of 68 which had been selected for detailed reporting in Spring 1972, (b) 13 schools which had reported initiating MUSE/IGE in late Spring 1972, and (c) 17 schools which had indicated plans for 1972-73 installation. Evidence shows that the MUSE/IGE organizational and instructional changes have taken hold in the majority of schools responding to the followup. Apparently attrition has been slight if existent at all, and many schools have come closer to institutionalizing the two areas of innovation. Related documents are ED 066 623 and ED 066 624. (Author/DN)

ED 073569

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PR - 73 - 3

A Supplement to

# The 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools

## A PROCESS EVALUATION

## THE FALL 1972 FOLLOW-UP

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Roderick A. Ironside

Project Director

OEC-0-71-3705

February 1973

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

EA 005 031

A Supplement to

# The 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools

## A PROCESS EVALUATION

## THE FALL 1972 FOLLOW-UP

### Foreword

The follow-up study reported here is a supplement to the process evaluation of the 1971-72 MUSE/IGE nationwide installation effort undertaken by the Wisconsin Research and Development Center. That evaluation--concerned with over 250 schools in ten states--was completed in the summer of 1972, and was contained in a two-volume report submitted to USOE in October and distributed to the national and state agencies which cooperated in the installation project.

The earlier report focused on several major purposes: accounting functions related to school participation in training programs and their status in implementing the new patterns; provision of normative data on a number of implementation practices at the school level; description of installation plans and services provided by state and national agencies; provision of a body of feedback potentially useful in planning, training, and preparation for future installation activities. Along with interpretation, conclusions, and recommendations, the report included several detailed case studies.

The follow-up, on the other hand, had but one major purpose: to determine basic implementation status in a number of schools--well into the second year--using the same criteria as had been employed earlier. This purpose was applied to the sample of schools studied in detail in the spring of 1972, to a group of schools which had implemented late in the 1971-72 year, and to another group which had reported intentions of installing the MUSE/IGE patterns in the fall of 1972. Brief questionnaires were sent to principals and IIC's in a total of 98 schools, and a few schools were contacted or visited in order to add to the previous case studies.

The study was predicated on the postulate that it is not sufficient to establish that the innovations were initiated in 1971-72 or the fall of 1972. It is equally important to discover that the patterns have been continued and/or strengthened in such a way that a minimal acceptable quality of implementation may be inferred. This follow-up is an initial step in that direction.

This study was conducted under contract with the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
O E Contract Number 0-71-3705

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina February 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Chapter

I Background, Purpose, and Summary..... 1
Purpose..... 2
Limitations..... 3
Summary..... 3

II Procedures..... 7
Instrument Development..... 7
Administration..... 8
School Visits..... 9
Analysis of Findings..... 9

III Findings and Interpretations.....11
Principals' Instrument.....12
IIC's Instrument.....16
Comparison Group.....23

IV Site-Visits to Multiunit/IGE Schools.....28
School Number 913.....28
School Number 203.....31
School Number 603.....34

V The Follow-up Picture.....37

Appendix

A Instruments used in the follow-up

B Tables Reporting Data from Principal's Instrument

C Tables Reporting Data from IIC Instrument

D Tables Reporting Data for Comparison Group (41 Schools)

# CHAPTER I

## Background, Purpose, and Summary

As it became apparent, during data-gathering activities of the 1971-72 school year, that a number of schools included on various rosters were either implementing MUSE/IGE elements late in the year or planning such implementations for 1972-73, the importance of a follow-up phase was recognized. Since an original emphasis in the evaluation project had been on auditing the installation program, a follow-up step seemed useful in order to account for the involvement of these schools. Moreover, as noted in the previous report, it would not appear sufficient merely to determine implementation on a yes-no basis; it would be more appropriate to define their participation in terms of certain basic implementation events or decisions.

Thus the existence of these two groups of schools--those installing MUSE and IGE late in the school year, and those indicating fall 1972 installation--provided the impetus for the follow-up activity. As it was considered, other potential benefits were noted as well which would apply to additional groups of schools.

For example, it had of course been understood that many schools would initiate the patterns at the beginning of the second semester of 1971-72, and their status in the subsequent year could be assessed to a degree (along with some of their needs). Too, it would be worthwhile to include a sample of schools which had installed in the fall of 1971, in order to determine something of the permanence of the organizational/instructional changes initiated at that time. For all groups of schools it would also be possible to discover clues as to whether or not the hiatus of the summer period had represented a source of renewed vigor and commitment for the second year, and whether or not there had been any attrition over the summer from actual practice of the innovative patterns.

Perhaps the most compelling consideration was the recognition--again as noted in the earlier report--that the sets of implementation criteria in use by the schools came increasingly to represent end-points after more than one year of exposure and practice; they could not justifiably be applied in their full form as first-year indicators of successful implementation because of

their number and complexity. (This is all the more important in view of the fact that the 1971-72 installation effort itself got off to a later-than-expected start in the spring of 1971. This was because of the funding schedule and the resultant pressures on state and local commitments, training arrangements, and preparation lead-time in many schools). Thus the notion of a follow-up permitted an application of this awareness, with attention (for a fair number of schools) to status near the middle of the second implementation year.

Finally, as is true in most follow-up ventures, it was felt that gathering fresh data might lead to new insights or reinforce prior conclusions. In addition, such an activity could contribute to the growing bodies of data about multiunit/IGE schools around the country (their backgrounds, nature, needs, inventiveness, adherence to models, solutions to problems, populations, organizational changes, and so on) and potentially lead to further recommendations for practice at various national, state, and local levels.

## Purpose

In summary, the major purpose of the follow-up study was to determine basic implementation status in a number of schools--at about the midpoint of the second year of the overall installation program--using selected criteria related to both MUSE and IGE programing. Since the study involved four groups of schools which varied by reported installation date, this purpose can be further detailed in terms of the following questions:

1. Did those schools which intended to initiate MUSE/IGE in the fall of 1972 actually do so? To what degree do they satisfy the four fundamental implementation criteria set by the R & D Center?

2. Did those schools which initiated part or all of MUSE/IGE in late spring 1972 continue with the patterns and build on them?

3. To what extent did a sample of schools which initiated MUSE/IGE in either January 1972 or September 1971 continue their involvement and satisfy the more extended implementation criteria which were employed with this sample in the May 1972 administration of the detailed questionnaires?

To the extent possible, it was also purposed (a) to obtain further feedback on status, needs, and practices which might be useful to national and state agencies, (b) to note growth in the fulfillment of basic implementation criteria over time, and (c) to arrive at potentially useful conclusions and recommendations.

## Limitations

Several limitations are noted which define the scope of the work or which indicate differences from the original evaluation study.

1. Only schools which were originally on the 1971-72 state and national rosters were contacted, regardless of their actual or intended installation dates. No "new" schools (that is, those added to the rolls for 1972-73 implementation) were included.

2. The same relatively few criteria (the four basic ones supplied by the R & D Center in February 1972, and the twelve included in the spring detailed questionnaires) were employed, whether schools installed MUSE/IGE in September 1971 or September 1972. No additional criteria were employed for schools entering their second full implementation year.

3. No attempt was made to study the training domain at any level, or to determine the kinds of support given to the schools by any source.

4. All data reported, for both questionnaires and visits, were in terms of the period December 1972-January 1973. For convenience, we will refer to the data-gathering period merely as "midyear."

5. No attempt was made to assess children's learning or achievement under the new organizational/instructional patterns.

6. No cross-checking was done in accounting for participation in MUSE/IGE; school responses alone were considered.

7. Very brief instruments were employed, and thus MUSE practices and those in the area of IGE instructional programing were noted in "gross," not detailed form.

## Summary of the Follow-up Study

A. Procedure. In all, 98 schools were chosen for the follow-up phase, including (a) the sample of 68 which had been selected for detailed reporting in spring 1972, (b) 13 schools which had reported initiating MUSE/IGE in the late spring; and 17 schools which had indicated plans for 1972-73 installation. There was a little overlap among these categories, which will be explained in the following chapter.

Very brief instruments (included as Appendix A) were developed by selecting items from the detailed questionnaires used in the main evaluation study. These instruments were reviewed, revised, and then mailed in early

December 1972 to principals and IIC's of the 98 schools. A follow-up administration to non-respondents was conducted in late December. In all there were 79 completed responses from principals and 74 from IIC's, with the vast majority coming from the same schools; other information was received from 3 schools. There was a response ratio of approximately 83%. Findings were analyzed by reported initiation dates, separately for principals and IIC's.

In addition, 3 school visits were made in the late fall, and a fourth school was contacted by telephone. These schools were selected on the subjective basis of their having had installation difficulties in the 1971-72 school year; all four had been on the 1971-72 visit schedule, and represented 3 different states. The same informal visit-report forms were employed as had been used in prior visits.

B. Findings. The major findings of the follow-up phase are summarized below:

1. Most schools polled--including the 9-72 group, appear to meet to an extent the four basic criteria set by the R & D Center: an active IIC, multiage grouping, IGE instruction, and full unitization. However, even among the 1971-72 groups, there are schools reporting no IIC or indicating multiage unit grouping without necessarily having multiaged instruction. A few schools reported having no specific IGE subject, and not all are fully unitized.
2. Based upon [illegible]e returns received, the vast majority of schools which indicated intentions of implementing in September 1972 did accomplish this goal--in terms of the basic criteria. One did not.
3. Based upon returns received, all schools which identified themselves with MUSE/IGE in 1971-72 continue to do so at midyear. There are a few indications of decreased commitment or less certain practices, but no instances of outright attrition. At the same time, it must be recognized that "identifying with MUSE/IGE" has different meanings to different schools and indeed there are cases where the labels are more evident than actual changes in school practice.
4. There were wide variations (within groups and within states) in the implementation practices engaged in, as had been true in 1971-72. In practice, there is no single definition of "an active IIC" or of

"fully unitized school" or of instructional programing--although of course conceptually these features have been clearly defined.

5. There continue to be diverse definitions of what constitutes the initial steps involved in adopting MUSE/IGE.
6. A considerable need for technical assistance was expressed, as much among the earlier-installing schools as among the 1972-73 group, across a large number of topics.
7. Schools indicated a wide range of obstacles to effective implementation, with all groups particularly noting lack of "time available for planning, grouping, preparation...in the units." A closely related--and major--area of concern was the instructional programing model in its several aspects. Needs for assistance and training and reinforcement were indicated in several different items.
8. As perceived by principals, staff attitudes at midyear were primarily positive toward both MUSE and IGE, in all groups of schools. By proportion, more staffs were reported as "enthusiastic" among fall-1971 implementers than among other groups; even so, in 3 of those schools none of the staff was rated as "enthusiastic," and in 5 schools more than 20% were rated as "cautious."

C. Conclusions. All evidences point toward the conclusion that the MUSE/IGE organizational and instructional changes have taken hold in the majority of schools responding to the follow-up. Apparently attrition has been slight if existent at all, and many schools have come closer to institutionalizing the two areas of innovation. It can also be concluded, however, that "success" in one arena does not imply success in the other. The expressed needs for assistance with appropriate instructional programing are so numerous as to suggest that this is a difficult thing for schools to adopt and put into practice, even in the second year. The organizational and facilitating aspects of MUSE, on the other hand, appear to have been more generally implemented in all groups.

Another conclusion is that the fulfillment of even the basic criteria is difficult to ascertain in absolute terms--and that therefore the schools treated here have made changes of one sort or another which may be taken to represent adoption and continuation of the MUSE/IGE innovations. In other

words, it is no more easy this year than last to determine "which schools have really installed the patterns." And if the answer to that matters, then we are left to rely on and suggest either (a) the prognostication approach mentioned in the earlier report or (b) the subjective though cumbersome approach involved in site visits. The latter can be both informative and useful as well as rewarding and stimulating, but the former requires some careful research into precise and powerful predictors.

A fourth conclusion is that postponing most or all implementation tasks to a later time may not result in making gains in fulfilling the implementation criteria. A number of schools, associated with MUSE/IGE at various levels in 1971-72, delayed "initiation" until the fall of 1972 and in effect extended their preparation time; however, as a group, these schools still lack certain features or practices, just as other schools did in 1971-72, and in addition indicate a number of problems and needs still to be met. It may be that there is a critical point in awareness and commitment (though extremely difficult to define) when schools should simply proceed and work things out little by little, rather than postponing til a more propitious time. Unless that interim period is an active one (with probing, experimenting, organizing, grouping, and so on), it may be of limited value.

A related conclusion--perhaps more a speculation--is that unless schools do get a fairly good start, and determine strong teacher commitment, and begin changes in a number of related MUSE/IGE factors, then they may find it difficult to "make up" for a weak start later. There are some schools--based upon questionnaire data and/or visits--which appear at midyear to be at about the same level of operation and expectation as during the 1971-72 school year. While such a circumstance may not be unexpected among so many schools, it is unfortunate; and it suggests the need for a well-defined set of goals at the outset of implementation, along with measurable amounts of commitment, materials, support, and awareness.

It is concluded that there continues to exist a very real need for technical assistance to the schools (and reinforcement of steps already taken), regardless of their installation dates. To be sure, the follow-up did not assess use or availability of resources, nor the nature of help being provided--but regardless of those resources, the majority of schools indicated a number of continuing needs in effectively putting into practice the instructional programing model, in particular. Other needs were expressed as well. Quite obviously, the means for meeting a number of these needs either do not exist conveniently, or are simply not known about.

## CHAPTER II

## Procedures

### Instrument Development

The instruments were adapted from the "detailed installation questionnaires" which had been developed for use in 1971-72 (see Appendix E in Volume I of the earlier report). Separate brief questionnaires were prepared for the principal and for the Instructional Improvement Committee (the IIC), with the expectation that the IIC would work as a group in completing the form. Instruments used in the follow-up are contained in Appendix A of this report.

Several considerations governed the selection of items. Of greatest importance, of course, was that the items should pro de data on the fulfillment of basic implementation criteria--both the original four emphases outlined by the R & D Center, and the expanded group of major topics which were utilized in the end-of-year assessment. These questions were concentrated in the IIC instrument, and dealt with the following concerns:

1. School has an active IIC
2. School follows instructional programing model in one subject
3. School is fully unitized
4. Students are multiaged within units
5. School makes use of many resources in fostering MUSE/IGE
6. School has differentiated staff functions
7. Teamwork works in the units
8. There is effective unit leadership
9. The level of commitment by teachers is high
10. Communications within the school are open
11. The library/IMC is well-stocked and well-used
12. Principal is an effective leader and catalyst

No attempt was made to give these topics equal weight in developing items or in projecting interpretation. Similarly, no attempt was made to order them in importance, except that the first four mentioned are the particular areas emphasized by R & D Center staff members in 1971-72. Moreover, because of the nature of the follow-up activity, many fewer items were employed than had been used in 1971-72; but reliance was still placed on the final question for the IIC which summarized on a yes-no basis a total of 26 specific queries covering the 12 major topical areas. As had been true in the 1971-72 study, these criteria--and the items related to them--reflected an awareness of inputs rather than outcomes. That is, emphasis remained on the conditions and decisions which presumably would set the stage for MUSE/IGE implementation

and which would also nurture the innovations in the opening year or two. The full range of criteria (or objectives) contained in the implementation guides are still perceived as outcomes after a two- to four-year period; their fulfillment could not be expected much earlier than that in most schools. Thus the twelve areas dealt with in the main study and in the follow-up relate to the areas presumably basic to a good start and then to the maintainence of satisfactory programs.

A few other items were repeated because of their particular interest or importance. For example, principals were asked to indicate when the school had "become a multiunit/IGE school" in order to clarify the accounting task, and similarly it seemed valuable to know how many principals were new to their schools this year. In the same way, IIC's were asked to indicate their gross assessment of the value of their League relationship, and to report whether or not the school had at any time developed its own "implementation timetable."

Other items were included for their feedback value--related to continuing problem areas, needs for technical assistance, and overall staff attitudes.

Instruments were reviewed by USOE and ETS personnel from the point of view of format and inclusion of appropriate items. It was determined that they would be suitable for administration to the various groups of schools, regardless of their initiation dates.

## Administration and Response

Instruments were administered by mail in early December 1972, to a total of 98 schools in 9 states (Nebraska and California schools were excluded, as they had been from the spring 1972 administration). A second mailing was made to non-respondents in late December.

Schools were selected on the basis of several different criteria, and are identified below in terms of these groupings:

A. The sample of 68 schools which had earlier been polled for detailed reporting of implementation status and practices, in May 1972; this group included September 1971 and January 1972 installers, and also included one school in Connecticut which indicated that it would "really" be implementing in September 1972.

B. All 20 schools in New Jersey; none of these had been included in the May 1972 sample, because implementation generally was initiated in April. Moreover, a number of these reported plans to install in September 1972 as opposed to the previous spring.

C. A group of 10 schools in Illinois which had reported plans to install MUSE/IGE in September 1972, rather than earlier.

Based upon all available information, with respect to actual and intended installation dates, and taking overlap into account, the 98 schools are defined as follows; the chart also indicates the number of principal and IIC responses in each category.

| | Total | Installed 9-71 | Installed 1-72 | Installed 4-72 | Indicated Plans to Install 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mailed | 98 | 56 | 11 | 13 | 18 |
| Responded P | 79 | 49 | 8 | 8 | 14 |
| IIC | 74* | 46 | 8 | 8 | 12 |

As noted earlier, contact was made with three other principals (two by mail and one by phone), bringing to 82 the total number of schools on which some sort of information was available for follow-up interpretation.

School Visits

Three schools, each in a different state, were visited in the late fall. Visits lasted a full school day, and included IIC and unit meetings where possible as well as numerous informal interviews and classroom observations. All schools had been included on the 1971-72 visit schedule, and visit records were available. In an effort to discover clues as to the solution of certain implementation difficulties, two schools were chosen because of their status near the end of the 1971-72 year. The third was selected after receipt of the follow-up responses, because of references to obstacles in both MUSE and IGE implementation. In the case of a fourth school, the earlier reporting of plans for September 1972 installation was the basis for selection; it was hoped to observe and discuss its implementation strategies. However, telephone contact sufficed to indicate that a visit would not be appropriate.

Analysis of Findings

Questionnaire findings were analyzed by summarizing various practices and conditions within the groups of schools already identified, in order to allow comparisons on the basic criteria across groups. Because of the small numbers involved, it seemed appropriate not to attempt to analyze or report by separate states. In addition, for certain critical items, comparisons between May and December responses were made for those schools which had completed both sets of instruments, in order to study aspects of change.

* There were actually responses from 3 more "IIC's" indicating that the school had no IIC.

Visit observations were summarized in case-study format. Two reports may be studied in relation to the full case-studies included in Volume I of the earlier evaluation report; the third combines references to an early 1971-72 visit and the 1972-73 midyear visit.

Communications

Communications with a number of state coordinators and R & D Center staff were continued, but to a lesser degree than in 1971-72. Announcements, newsletters, monitoring instruments, and reports of training and other cooperative endeavors between the states and the Center, were all studied and used as a "context" in which the follow-up was conducted. (However, the resulting information was not codified or summarized, and no attempt was made to report on these interactions or the sorts of support and assistance supplied to the schools).

The R & D Center continued, in 1972-73, to work through the state coordinators, but also began to work directly with district coordinators in larger communities planning to install MUSE/IGE in the 1973-74 school year. Thus, an effort has been made to make the Center's expertise and experience more directly available to local schools. The Center also reported the initiation of a number of research projects related to various facets of the MUSE/IGE patterns.

It should also be noted that--based upon available information--certain state coordinators have arranged needed assistance to schools, promoted smaller and therefore presumably more effective Leagues of schools, and begun to initiate monitoring and feedback procedures between the state office and the schools.

## CHAPTER III

## Findings and Interpretations

It must be reiterated that generalizing is a difficult practice to avoid. Since schools involved in the follow-up were not selected on a strictly random basis, and since in several cases the numbers are so small as not to justify tests of significance, it would be inappropriate to attempt generalizations to the larger cohorts of schools which these subgroups inescapably "represent." For example, we have no information from several schools which reportedly were to install in September 1972; the fact that all but one of the responding schools apparently did proceed with installation cannot be used to suggest anything about the non-respondents' status. Similarly, the frequency of particular obstacles reported by the subgroups cannot assure similar frequencies within the cohorts nor guarantee equally extensive differences across cohorts.

We do suggest, though, that three sorts of applications of the findings may be made. One is to infer, cautiously, that the range of practices, problems, needs, and solutions which emerged in the study probably occurs among schools not polled or not responding. It seems likely, in other words, that variations may reasonably be expected--and perhaps even specifically predicted--simply on the basis of broad general experience in the field of educational practice. (We would not suggest, however, that one assume that "95% of schools have active IIC's" just because this appears to be true in the present sample). The second possible application is to draw the sort of conclusion that says, "On the whole...the MUSE/IGE patterns appear to...and are likely to continue..." The third application, of course, is that when one finds a noteworthy similarity or difference in these findings, he might suggest that indeed the matter be put to the test in a formal way.

The findings are reported for three subgroups: those installing in (a) September and January of the 1971-72 year, (b) late spring 1972, and (c) September 1972. The second group is of special interest because of the installation date; and the third, of course, because it represents potential fruition of expressed intentions.

Reference is made in the text to tables, which appear as Appendix B for data supplied by school principals, and as Appendix C for IIC data. Table numbers use the P prefix for principals, and I for the IIC. The table headings show in each case the total number of respondents for the instrument,

though there might be "omits" for particular items. Percentages are entered where this information might be useful.

Comparisons are also made between two sets of responses for a group of 43 schools, those whose principals and IIC's responded in both May 1972 and December 1972 to the same items. These were all 1971-72 schools, and were included in the sample whose implementation was studied in some detail at year's end. Most of the 44 installed in September 1971 (and some 5 in January 1972); they are treated here as a single group, just as they were in the original evaluation report for the "detailed installation sample." Data are contained in tables with the S prefix, in Appendix D.

Findings from the Principal's Instrument

In all, 79 principals responded to the questionnaire in full, and 2 others sent in brief notes. On the basis of response to the question "Became multiunit/IGE school in...," all of these 81 schools may be identified as participants in the two patterns as of midyear 1972-73. (No responses were received from schools indicating that either they had reduced the degree of their involvement or had not installed as intended in September 1972). Of the 67 schools installing in 9-71 and 1-72, the 58 respondents reported their schools' continuing in the MUSE/IGE patterns; of the 13 which installed in 4-72, all 8 respondents indicated continued participation; and of the 18 which had announced plans to install in 9-72, the 15 respondents revealed that indeed they had proceeded with those plans.

The findings discussed above were borne out by principals' responses concerning numbers of unit leaders, staff attitudes toward MUSE and IGE, definition of MUSE/IGE initiation, and problem-areas experienced. Thus, participation at midyear was verified by cross-checking various items.

(Beyond those schools referred to above, there was one instance of non-participation noted. This was determined by phone when an attempt was made to set up a visit. The principal had earlier indicated plans for fall 1972 installation, but by midyear reported that other circumstances (a building addition, preparation for new students and teachers) had precluded their taking formal implementation steps).

An interesting sidelight on this very high degree of continued participation is that in each of the three "installation-date categories" referred to throughout this report (9-71 and 1-72; 4-72; 9-72), a few schools (from 2 to 4) have taken on new principals for the 1972-73 year. We have no information regarding principals' transfer from one MUSE/IGE school to another, but in view of the states and numbers involved, this seems most unlikely.

What appears impressive is that 4 schools with a 9-72 installation date (and thus with spring 1972 planning and preparation) proceeded with MUSE/IGE under a brand-new principal. (There are also 7 cases--in the 9-71/1-72, and 4-72 groups--where the present principal was not in that role during the 1970-71 school year, suggesting something of the durability of the preparation and installation steps under a change in leadership).

The remainder of this section reports on other data from the principals questionnaire, most of which is in the nature of feedback.

As shown in Table P-1, when principals were asked to mark one act or circumstance which best defined the beginning point of MUSE/IGE installation, as a group they indicated 11 different activities. This range is almost as wide as that for the spring 1972 respondents, and illustrates again--particularly with the 9-72 group--that such initiation date is often conceived as a decision long antedating any direct effects upon children. In all 3 groups, the most frequent response was the school staff's decision to become committed to MUSE/IGE. As was true last year, the criteria indicated for the beginning point of MUSE/IGE installation are indeed diverse and perhaps contradictory, at least at the school level.

Two principals supplied marginal notes of some philosophic interest. One backed off and remarked, "We are only a modified MUSE school," implying that after all they had not formally begun (?), while the other had a much broader view of the meaning of initial implementation steps. Said he, "Not yet. In several years, after there are results."

Table P-2 outlines what principals reported as serious and continuing obstacles to installation. The item most frequently checked in all three groups (from 40% to 64% of principals) was teachers' overworking, followed roughly by problems in the area of inservice training, ineffective leadership in some of the units, unit problems in teamwork, and lack of assistance from outside the school. Difficulties, of course, are anticipated, and the number and range of responses is not surprising. What may be of note, however, is that certain problem-areas continue to emerge in the 9-71/1-72 group, those schools now in their second full year of implementation. Principals in 20% or more of these schools noted that unit leadership, role confusion, teacher overwork, lack of outside assistance, unit teamwork, the IMC, and inservice training all posed obstacles at midyear.

A few of the other entries are also of interest even though indicated by a very small number of schools: (a) serious implementation of the programing model, (b) time for IIC meetings, (c) problems in the area of multiaged instructional groups, and (d) unit planning time. On the other hand, it may be taken as a note of encouragement in the whole implementation process that so few principals (in any group) indicated problems with (a) training new teachers, (b) conflict with other District programs, (c) teacher resistance to unit leaders, and (d) scheduling special subjects.

Across all three groups, number of problem-entries ranged from 1 to 7 per principal, but with meaningfully different averages: 2.5 for the 9-71/1-72 groups; 3.5 for the 4-72 group, and 4.0 for 9-72 schools. It would appear that the "newer" the school, the larger the number of perceived obstacles (and the converse also noted).

Tables P-3 and P-4 describe principals' ratings of staff commitment to the MUSE and IGE patterns, separately, as an indication of the school's "affective atmosphere." Using a 4-point scale (cautious, neutral, agreeable, enthusiastic), principals were asked to rate total staff attitude.

Table P-3 shows the range of reported attitudes in all three groups and across both MUSE and IGE patterns. Each row represents the categories into which principals placed any staff, regardless of percentages. Thus, for example, in 32 schools alltold, entries were made at all four points -- while in a total of 21 schools, all teachers had been ranked as feeling "agreeable" or "enthusiastic." The most fascinating combination--reported by 2 principals --was the division of the staff into those who were cautious and those who were enthusiastic; in both cases, 15% or more of the staff were ranked as cautious.

Certainly the overall finding is that principals ranked their staffs toward the positive end of the scale. This is less true, however, in the 9-72 group, where 11 of the 14 schools had some staff ranked as "cautious" while in only 2 schools was the whole staff rated agreeable and/or enthusiastic. The chart below provides additional information about the nature of the ratings across the three groups, in terms of number of schools; these are overlapping counts and do not add up to the total N's of any group.

| | 9-71 + 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | N's...57 | 8 | 14 |
| No staff rated cautious | 27 | 4 | 3 |
| No staff rated enthusiastic | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| More than 20% staff rated cautious | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Majority rated cautious | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Majority rated enthusiastic | 25 | 5 | 4 |
| Majority rated agreeable | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| Majority rated agreeable/enthusiastic | 14 | 5 | 2 |
| Majority rated cautious/neutral | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Majority rated neutral/agreeable | 3 | 1 | 0 |

Analysis of the percentage findings strongly supports the generally positive attitudes indicated above. Table P-4 shows the percentage ranges and means for MUSE and IGE separately, for each of the three populations. With one or two exceptions, the findings are practically the same for both MUSE and IGE in each group, but there is a pattern of difference observable between groups. Using the 9-71/1-72 group as a base, it can be seen that the 4-72 group is less enthusiastic but more agreeable (with virtually the same proportions in the cautious and neutral categories). The 9-72 group shows the same mean percentage in the enthusiastic category, but the remainder are spread over the other 3 classifications more evenly. Thus there is a clear hierarchy in "level of commitment" from the group which installed earliest up to the most recent set of schools.

Principals were asked to rate unit leaders on a number of desirable qualities. Table P-5 outlines the findings for the 9-72 group only, using a scale of Poorly, Adequately, and Well to define midyear performance. Principals as a group are clearly satisfied with unit-leader leadership, since in every case 85% of more of the 46 unit leaders involved were rated as doing either Adequately or Well on each item. The highest proportions in the "Well" category were for participation in the IIC (59%), schoolwide liaison functions (56%), and good teaching (54%). In just two cases was a sizable proportion of unit leaders (15%) rated as doing poorly...(a) monitoring all aspects of unit operation, and (b) maintaining effective communication with parents.

Finally, principals were indirectly asked about their major implementation concern; this was approached in terms of a workshop they felt most important for the school staff to undertake. Table P-6 lists the 17 discrete topics

which resulted from the content-analysis and shows the frequency within each of the three groups. As in the case of continuing serious obstacles (see Table P-2), it is not remarkable that the 9-72 population had a range of concerns similar to those which emerged in the May inquiry; but it is noteworthy that a number of those matters are still of concern to the 9-71/1-72 group of principals. In particular, the need for improved group processes, reaquaintance with concepts of individulization, and practical aspects of the instructional programing model are noted.

Virtually every response related to a need which a workshop could be addressed to, and which presumably would require the assistance of outsiders. "How to find planning time" doesn't appear to fall under that rubric, nor does "Workshop not needed." Of special interest are two of the single entries: organize an IIC, and evaluate our progress; the former reflects a lack in basic installation steps, and the latter reveals a concern with overall assessment and improvement.

## Findings from the IIC Instrument

Completed responses were received from 74 schools in all, in almost exactly the same proportions as returns from principals; numbers for the three separate populations are indicated in the tables (Appendix C). While the principals' returns were used for determining whether or not a school was participating in the MUSE/IGE patterns, the IIC instrument served to indicate something of the degree of that involvement. For example, items were included which related to time spent on various IIC functions, characteristics of IIC meetings, unit organization, IGE subjects, and the summary of 12 basic implementation areas. From a numerical as well as percentage standpoint, the tables may be used in comparing the three implementation groups as well as in acquiring a sense of overall status in the 1972-73 midyear point.

In order to clear up tabulating confusion, it is noted that (a) one IIC instrument was received at the last moment and only its summary item (see Table I-8) was included in this report, and (b) 3 IIC forms were returned with the notation that the school did not have an IIC, although on one of them much information had been supplied.

Interestingly, those 3 schools had installed MUSE/IGE in the fall of 1971 and were located in the same state; all had reported last year not having an IIC set up, so they do not represent a specific IIC attrition. They do,

however, pose important practical and theoretical questions about the necessity of having the IIC and its ultimate importance in the accomplishment of individualized education...especially in very small schools. (All of these have fewer than 200 students and are organized into 1 or 2 units).

The nature of the IIC--and its place in the school structure--is made a little more moot by responses to the question, "When did the IIC begin functioning as the governing group for the school's instructional program?" Along with dates supplied by most IIC's, there were those notations provided by others:

(a) 9-71 and 1-72
"not in toto"
"haven't"
"?"
"to a small degree"
"GOVERNING group?????"

(b) 4-72
"IIC makes suggestions, not decisions"

(c) 9-72
"not yet"
"does not apply"
"?"

Such marginal notes give pause...about the need for absolute criteria, and also about the eventual success of MUSE/IGE in those schools. With that in mind, Table I-1 may be studied regarding the number of IIC's engaging in various formal functions (drawn from the implementation guidelines). For any of the 6 given functions, the number of schools reporting its inclusion varied from 62% to 100% though to be sure the great majority of IIC's indicated some attention given to all 6 areas. Considering the 3 populations, the area attended to by the greatest number of schools was "planning for 1972-73 and 1973-74 operations" (average of 96% of IIC's); the area given least attention was "planning and arranging schoolwide inservice training" (average of 75% of the IIC's).

Great variation was found in terms of reported time proportions devoted to the various functions, many of them reported at 5% of IIC time.* Some 47 of the 74 IIC's emphasized one area to the deemphasis of the others, sometimes reporting as much as 80% of their time on one topic. The chart below indicates the number of schools reporting from 40% to 80% of IIC time on a given function.

| | 9-71 + 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Monitor IGE implementation; evaluate | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| Deal with, explain to parents | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Aid units re IGE subject, materials | 10 | 1 | 2 |
| Plan, arrange schoolwide inservice | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Manage school, & personnel relations | 16 | 3 | 1 |
| Plan for 1972-73 and 1973-74 operations | 4 | 1 | 0 |

* One IIC reported its time devoted to all 6 categories, totaling 100%... and then added 50% time under "Other." A marginal note explained: "We work 150% of the time. Ha Ha!"

Table I-2 outlines the implementation problems noted when IIC's were asked to indicate the 4 most serious obstacles. As noted earlier, attention is directed to the fact that the 1971-72 group of schools checked all 28 items, suggesting the pervasive and continuing nature of these particular problem-areas. On the other hand, the 4-72 and 9-72 populations checked fewer items, notably omitting "supply of large variety of teaching materials," "implementing the IGE programing model," and "teaching all the various sizes of instructional groups." For the 9-72 group in particular, other evidence corroborates the lack of apparent difficulty with the instructional programing model.

In all 3 groups, the most frequent obstacles (ranging from 33% to 63% of the IIC's) were "keeping records and recording student progress for IGE" and "time for planning, evaluating, preparation, in the units." Several other topics were emphasized (33% or more) but not necessarily by all three populations. These were:

grouping students for instruction
multiage grouping
overall school and unit schedules
coordination of use of space, staff, materials

Across all groups of schools, it seemed important to get at the "active nature" of the IIC in terms of its meeting. Table I-3 describes several such features.

The vast majority reported meeting on a regular basis, for at least 1 hour per week. In most cases these were scheduled at a given time, although this was unaccountably not the pattern for the 9-72 group. About 80% of all IIC's regularly prepared agendas for the meetings, (though many of these did not distribute them in advance). The maintainence of minutes or a log, however, was much less common in all three groups; an average of 63% of the IIC's kept such records, which appears to weaken the potential benefits of this governing group. In the majority of schools, minutes were regularly distributed after meetings and non-IIC members were sometimes asked to attend meetings.

Overall, IIC's appeared to be active groups...holding regularly scheduled meetings, preparing agendas, and addressing a wide range of concerns (as reported in Table I-1). On the other hand, some IIC's may be judged to be less vital, by virtue of irregular meetings, failure to keep a formal record of decisions and actions, omission of a prepared agenda, and emphasis on 1 or 2 responsibilities to the detriment of others. Specifically--and in addition

to the 3 schools without IIC's--a total of 11 schools were found to have neither agenda nor log; and 5 in all had neither agenda, log, nor regularly scheduled meetings.

Table I-4 shows that relatively small proportions (48%, 12%, and 25%) of schools had at any time developed an overall implementation timetable. In view of the complex nature of the practices envisioned in both MUSE and IGE, this seems an unfortunate circumstance. Of course, this may reflect the intention to implement only partially, but in any case it would appear appropriate for IIC's to outline carefully the sequence of their proposed steps.

On the question of active membership in a linkage group, Table I-5 reveals that an average of 71% of schools considered themselves to be in this category. Schools which responded NO to this item are in 7 different states; to our knowledge, all 8 states involved have formal linkage groups, so that either some schools are inactive by choice or do not know this resource is available. (Two schools made marginal notes to the effect that it "would be a good thing, if we had one.") The majority of IIC's noting their active membership also reported that the linkage group was generally of value to the school; again, those responding NO to the question of benefit are located in 6 different states.

As outlined in Table I-6, IIC's were asked to describe their 2 or 3 "most pressing needs for technical assistance." Most entries indeed referred to needs but not specifically needs for technical assistance. IIC's apparently used this opportunity to repeat their concerns with such matters as planning time, personnel, materials, and so on, and many schools limited their entries to these non-technical areas. The table shows these in Section B; the upper portion is used for the more frequent entries, and the lower portion for cases where an item was mentioned only 1 or 2 times. As can be seen, the two B sections contain a number of real, though non-technical, concerns (for example: discipline, duplication of testing materials, and money!).

The A sections list what may be considered true technical assistance needs. The most frequently-mentioned topic was "general help in implementing IGE" (a total of 12 entries across all 3 groups). In addition, many schools listed separate elements more specifically:

grouping students (3)
techniques for evaluation, assessment (5)
record-keeping (5)
writing objectives (3)
developing learning modules (3)

Except for these aspects of the instructional programing model, there are few clear signals as to the most common pressing needs. Much of the response to this item is in strictly local terms where a particular need has developed or, more importantly, been recognized. For example, it is encouraging to note certain more sophisticated entries such as evaluating teacher effectiveness, use of learning centers, multiaging, coutinuous teacher-training, and integration of primary and kindergarten programs.

We infer some difficulty in defining specific needs in the MUSE/IGE schools, and in recognizing those which might be technical in nature. Many schools, to be sure, indicated very real requirements for continued assistance, but others listed the sorts of needs that any non-IGE school might have. Moreover, 13 IIC's omitted this item, 4 noted "unsure" or words to that effect, and 3 others wrote in merely "None."

The area of unit organization was also studied. Table I-7 reports on various unit characteristics, showing, for example, that an average of 70% of schools were fully unitized. The most common exception to full unitization was a separate kindergarten program, though in a few schools various combinations of grades 1 through 8 were not yet organized into units. Moreover, 4 schools in the 9-71 population which had had but 1 unit in 1971-72, continued at midyear with that same unit even though these were schools with large student bodies.

The table also reports the number of schools in which all units appear to be multiaged; across the 3 groups, an average of 80% of schools were so classified. In the remaining schools there was a mixture of multiaged and grade-level units, or simply grade-level units. What appears equally important is that when it comes to instruction itself, oftentimes that is done on a grade-level basis even in multiaged units. This is true for both the formal IGE subject(s) and other instructional areas. It can be inferred that while the great majority of units are multiaged as an organizational strategy, the ensuing instruction is much less frequently addressed to multiaged groups of

children. This is true in all 3 populations, with some variation where perhaps instruction is multiaged for one IGE subject but not for another. It appears important to emphasize the fact of extensive instruction to non-multiaged groups, especially in view of the number of schools which reported 2, 3, and 4 formalized IGE subjects at midyear.

Table I-7 further reports that about 75% of the units use their meeting time for occasional inservice training (in all 3 populations), and that almost 90% of the units report that all unit teachers teach the IGE subject(s). While the latter is the intent of the implementation plan, it also reflects the fact that many teachers are functioning in essentially self-contained grade-level classrooms, and thus in fact teach all subjects, whether IGE or not.

The final question in the IIC instrument was intended as a summary statement of status regarding twelve major aspects of implementation. Responses to the 26 discrete items are contained in Table I-3, with separate entries for the 3 populations of interest; YES and NO tabulations are shown, along with indications of partial fulfillment (in the column headed "?"). On a cautious assumption that each item "should" have been answered YES in order to comply with installation intentions, it can be seen that in many instances this criterion was not attained. Percentages of YES responses varied from 37% to 100% across the 3 groups, with the great majority of YES responses above the 75% level.

As to the four basic implementation criteria, there were some differences apparent among the 3 populations. For example, approximately 90% of the 9-71/1-72 and the 4-72 groups reported an "active IIC" in terms of regular meetings and instructional decisions; for the 9-72 group, it was about 85% of the IIC's, with more reporting decision functions than indicated having regularly scheduled meetings.

On the question of multiaging, 86%, 75%, and 100% indicated multiaged units, for the 3 populations. Percentages were lower in each case with respect to instruction's being typically directed to multiaged groups.

Regarding the IGE subject, 100% of all groups reported having at least one such formal IGE subject-area, and approximately 88% of all groups reported its being implemented in all the school's units. As to the instructional programing model, however, there was less unanimity; respectively, 74%, 88%, and 77% of IIC's reported the model's being followed in all the units with IGE

subject(s). (The frequency with which this model has been mentioned as a problem-area, or a topic for technical assistance, should be recalled).

As to full unitization, 74%, 100%, and 70% of IIC's reported that all students were organized into units. There is some confounding here, however, since many schools reported both full unitization and a separate kindergarten. Apparently, integration of the kindergarten (if there is one) with a primary instructional unit is not always perceived as a requisite to full unitization.

As Table I-8 reveals, the other areas of concern present a wide range of implementation status within and across the 3 populations. Areas which appear to need strengthening in all groups are (a) the IMC, both its stock and its utilization, (b) instruction to multiaged groups of children, (c) use of the instructional programing model as a rule within IGE subjects, (d) full unitization and kindergarten/primary integration, (e) unit leader assignment of a variety of responsibilities within units, and (f) periodic or regular inservice training. On the other hand, several areas stand out as especially strong in all groups: (a) regularly scheduled IIC meetings, (b) open lines of communication in the school, (c) encouragement of new instructional practices by the principal, (d) presence of at least one IGE subject, (e) satisfaction of unit members with their peers and with teamwork, and (f) general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education, which apparently is more highly valued than the multiunit structure itself.

All things considered, the variations within the 4-72 and 9-72 groups are not unexpected. By midyear they had been involved in actual implementation for 6 months at the most (not counting the summer), and their status must be considered as "first-year status." On the other hand, the 9-71/1-72 group responded very similarly (in percentage terms) to the basic implementation aspects discussed above...and yet most had been operative for a total of 12 or 13 months. Strengths and weaknesses were held very much in common, as also discussed above.

At this juncture, one is led to the speculation that certain MUSE/IGE input components are inherently easier or more difficult than others to implement, and that the passage of time and addition of experience may have r lible effects on the improvement of criterion fulfillment. In all groups, example, the instructional materials center (IMC), in terms of its stock oi materials and utilization by staff and students, is apparently a quite

difficult component to implement. Similarly, inservice training for the whole school staff has not characterized the MUSE/IGE implementation in any of these groups, even when labeled "periodic." On the other hand, IIC's are quite apparently easy to set up and schedule meetings for (although this is not so much the case for actual management of the instructional program), and the adoption of an IGE subject is a relatively simple task (though the same cannot be said for implementation of the instructional programing model per se).

Comparison Group of Schools

In a rough way, it is possible to compare the detailed-questionnaire findings from May 1972 (for a group of some 55 schools) as contained in the earlier report--with the data acquired at midyear from the approximately 55 schools in the 9-71/1-72 group. This would be possible and legitimate with respect to items administered to the principal and the IIC. HOWEVER, the two groups of schools are not the same, since some responded at one time but not at the other.

In order to set up an appropriate comparison group, and permit at least a look at change from the end of the first year to the middle of the second, data have been examined from a group of 43 schools whose principals and IIC's responded in both May 1972 and at midyear 1972-73. These schools represent 8 states, and virtually all of them initiated implementation in September 1971. A few items in particular were considered and are discussed below.

Two items from the principals' instrument were compared, primarily for their feedback value. The first concerned assessment of general staff attitudes toward MUSE and IGE, using the scale Cautious-Neutral-Agreeable-Enthusiastic. As indicated in the chart below, the positive and negative changes reported, along with the 17 situations where the ratings were vitually the same in May and December--revealed that the net effect across all 43 schools was "no change." There were about as many changed ratings in the positive direction as in the negative, and to roughly the same degree. (Entries below relate to combined ratings for the MUSE and IGE innovations).

| Nature of Ratings | Number of Schools |
|---|---|
| 1. 30% or more staff changed from Agreeable to Enthusiastic | 9 |
| 2. 30% or more staff changed from Cautious to Neutral or Agreeable | 1 |
| 3. Some small overall change to the positive | 3 |
| 4. Virtually same ratings at both points | 17 |
| 5. 30% or more staff changed from Enthusiastic to Agreeable or Neutral | 7 |
| 6. Some small overall change to the negative | 6 |

What appears important here is that the reported attitude changes for particular schools may indeed be significant. So far as principals' perceptions are concerned, in some schools the staff is notably less favorably disposed to the patterns, while in others the converse is true. And again, the attitudes in 17 (or 31%) of the schools apparently changed not at all. (From the validity standpoint, it should be noted that in 41 of the 43 schools the same principal made the ratings both times).

The other item concerned a checklist of continuing and serious problems perceived as hindering effective implementation. Table S-1 provides some hints about the possible first-year problem areas which may tend to become resolved in the second (or third) year.

There was no case where a problem dropped out of the picture, but a decrease was noted especially in the following areas:

confusion over roles and responsibilities
availability of outside consulting assistance
in-school communication problems of various sorts
IMC materials, staffing, and utilization
inservice training factors

In addition, two increases were noted, though small: staff lack of commitment and departmentalization within the units.

In considering this particular list of potential problem-areas, it may help also to indicate the number of checklist changes, by schools. The chart below shows the number of principals who checked more or fewer items in December as compared with May. In 8 cases, exactly the same number was checked at both points.

| | Number of problem-areas either decreased or increased | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of schools indicating decreased number of problems | 11 | 14 | | | 1 |
| Number of schools indicating increased number of problems | 6 | 1 | 2 | | |

* * * * * * * * *

Three IIC items were chosen for comparison and for indications of growth toward an implementation in line with the original R & D Center installation criteria. The first does not represent a particular criterion, but does seem an especially important step for IIC's to take: the development of an overall implementation timetable.

In May, 19 schools indicated that by then they had already developed such a master plan. Another 24 schools reported that they had not done so, and these are of interest. Asked the same question at midyear, 15 of those IIC's responded that they had engaged in that activity, and 9 reported no such attempt. Little can be said in the way of interpretation, except that some growth was noted and the value and utility of the resulting implementation timetable can be inferred. We have no empiric evidence that lack of such a master plan makes a difference in the quality of implementation, but site-visit experience strongly suggests such an inference; it is a point which should be pursued.

Table S-2 reports on the "active nature" of the IIC with implied indications of vitality and relevance in the schools. Four characteristics were chosen, relating to (a) regularity of meetings, (b) regular preparation of IIC agenda, (c) maintainence of minutes and/or IIC log, and (d) distribution of minutes after each meeting.

The May responses are indicated for the 43 schools, in separate YES and NO columns, followed by the midyear replies. As can be seen, of the schools which originally indicated not engaging in the particular practices, some had made positive changes by December. For example, 1 IIC now has regular meetings and 9 IIC's now keep a formal log. These may be considered gains in implementation practices above and beyond merely "having" an IIC. Surprisingly, however, there were also losses in each of the 4 categories. Of the 26 IIC's which in May kept a formal log, for example, 4 apparently dropped this practice by midyear. Two schools reported not any longer having "regularly scheduled" IIC meetings.

In terms of numbers involved, the gains exceed the losses. But the existence of the "losses" at all is puzzling. What is needed, of course, is some evidence that these IIC characteristics are essential to MUSE/IGE operations; they may not be. But at face, they appear to be important indicators of a healthy MUSE structure. As the table makes clear, there were a number of schools which continued not to have various of the 4 features (as noted in the right-hand column).

Of greatest interest, perhaps, is comparison of responses to the summary question relating to the twelve basic implementation areas. Table S-3* reports on findings from 41 schools, relating to the 26 separate items. The May 1972 responses are tallied as a comparison base (Yes, No, and "partial");

*Two schools did not complete this summary question.

then entries are provided showing number of change responses, (a) from NO in May to YES at midyear, and (b) from YES in May to NO at midyear. These include a very small number of "partial" responses, which for present purposes are considered the same as NO responses.

Two IIC's reported exactly the same status in both May and December. The changes for the remaining 39 schools are discussed below.

There were 112 changes in all from NO to YES, covering 27 of the 28 separate items. As can be seen, 14 of these were at a frequency of 4 or more, 4 being arbitrarily selected as a useful cutoff point. The largest number of positive changes (9 and 11 respectively) were made concerning the IMC stock of materials and the utilization of the IMC by staff and students. For three other factors, 8 NO-YES changes were reported: differentiated staff functions in the units, increased instructional involvement of the principal, and adherence to the instructional programing model.

Comparison of the NO column for the May administration with the NO to YES changes--shows many items where all the schools involved changed from NO to YES, supporting a high degree of satisfactory implementation status at midyear...for those schools...and for those particular implementation activities. For example, all 5 schools which had previously indicated not having an IIC which made decisions about the instructional program, by mid-year had changed that to a positive response. The same holds for having at least one IGE subject and the multiaging of units.

However, as Table S-3 also makes clear, some schools reported regression with respect to 26 of the 28 items, for a total of 62 YES to NO changes; these were most pronounced in the areas of following the instructional model (6 changes) and conducting schoolwide inservice (5 changes). Thus, in the twelve areas of major concern, as well as in the 4 basic areas (active IIC, full unitization, multiaging, and use of IGE programing model)--there were both gains and losses. In a few cases, these losses exceeded the number of gains. In net, the whole circumstance raises certain questions about (a) the permanence of some MUSE/IGE features after being instituted, and (b) the real importance of these particular elements. Of course some of them are inherently the substance of the innovations, and without them, the MUSE/IGE patterns would not exist at all. Others are more supportive and facilitory in nature, and may not be so important.

(It must be said, in this connection, that after all, schools did participate in 1971-72 in the new patterns, did initiate many of the criteria which had been promulgated, and did indeed institute real instructional changes along individualized lines...even though they were not able to respond YES to all of these 28 basic items. The question is more one of a healthy growing implementation, and one of a prognosis of permanence of meaningful educational practices; and presumably the more of these elements which are present, the more likely the school will be to continue its MUSE/IGE participation. As with the vitality of the IIC discussed earlier, this issue requires further exploration).

There were 112 NO to YES changes, and 62 YES to NO changes. The difference--50 changes to the positive--was accounted for in large measure by just 6 schools, one of which had 14 new YES responses (and 2 new NO's). From one point of view, it is discouraging that the net of 50 YES responses does not reflect growth across all schools; from another, it is useful to note that a few schools which were at a low level of implementation status in May 1972 had, by midyear 1972-73, altered that status in what appears to be a very meaningful way.

In order to give a sense of the nature and frequency of changes reported by given schools, Table S-4 provides a matrix of YES to NO changes as against NO to YES changes for the 41 schools involved. (Two schools had no changes in either direction). It is clear that a number of schools experienced an equal or near-equal number of changes in both the positive and negative directions.

## Chapter IV

## Site-Visits to Multiunit/IGE Schools

Visits were made to three elementary schools, each in a different state, partly to keep in touch with the "real world" of implementation in general, but mostly to study current status at the midyear point in these particular schools.

All three had been on the visit roster for 1971-72, and records and reports were available for study and comparison. For schools 203 and 913, their case studies may be read in Volume I of the earlier report, for reference on background, problems, successes, and general 1971-72 developments. For school 603, the report in this chapter will include some information concerning 1971-72 status, as a basis for study of the recent visit report.

During the one-day visits, efforts were made to have interviews with principal, any district administrative personnel, staff teachers, librarian, unit leaders, children, aides, and student-teachers. Where possible, IIC and unit meetings were attended as well; and observations were made in classrooms, library, and other learning centers.

### School Number 913

The situation by midyear had changed very little as compared with the spring of 1972. The potential for MUSE/IGE development appeared to be at about the same level and no notable implementation advances were observed. This seems best explained by the apparent fact that attitudes and conditions noted in the spring had continued, and had not been countered by decisive actions, plans, or changes.

Both MUSE and IGE are "vague concepts" in this school. Most staff do not identify with these labels and appear not to be aware that their school is on the outer fringe of a potentially valuable educational change. This seems closely related to a major finding here: there has been virtually no contact with other persons, schools, agencies, or materials related to MUSE/IGE. The state agency has not visited (in the fall) nor provided other assistance; but the school itself has also remained aloof. No representatives to League meetings; no teacher to a problem-oriented workshop sponsored nearby; no one has visited other nearby schools. (As P said in referring to the latter, "What could I gain except <u>their</u> problems?") Inservice training has come to a standstill. Use of booklets and filmstrips in and by the "units" has virtually ceased.

To be frank, one gets the impression that the staff is in effect deceiving itself about being an IGE school. To be sure, there is considerable agitation and action relating to individualized instruction, but this is limited to 1 unit where all children are in "open classrooms." Academic progress is not assessed systematically there, however, and instruction is not geared to stated objectives.

In another unit it is not clear just what is happening. In the third, an individualized math program has been adopted, and some teachers have received training in it; the attitude is that this program is the ultimate, and that adopting it automatically makes this an "IGE unit." But there is no cross-teaching; very little sharing of materials, methods or purposes; no instruction

except in self-contained classrooms; each teacher has his/her own goals and textbooks; and they are playing with individualization in reading ("Yes, we have divided each room into 3 reading groups, by their ability of course"). Three teachers independently implied that they do not expect ever to share children, rooms, resources, teaching skills, or..."real" decisions about "my" classroom.

Probably the most telling observation is that a distinct rivalry has indeed developed between the Open-classroom unit and the IGE-unit. The IGE-unit group feels that P and IIC have catered to the Open-group, and as a result have come to defend the traditional, self-contained, closed-door, textbook-oriented, grade-level, single-aged, teacher-dominated sort of education they are offering.

As to the librarian and the library, that situation has not changed. The librarian is bright, eager, child-oriented, and full of ideas for making the library into a true IMC. However, additional space was not provided, teachers are still reluctant to confer with librarian about study-units, and most teachers still feel that the library is a place for "quiet reference and merely choosing a book." Librarian is not an IIC member this year, since P felt this would be an imposition on her time. The specialists-unit of which she is UL appears to exist in name only; its main function is to meet so that UL can distribute messages for P. (This is--unfortunately--not an exaggeration).

Suffice it to say that two "unit meetings" were observed.

The IIC meeting was observed. It may have been atypical that day. P did not show up; there was no agenda; the invited advisor from district (on certain unit financial matters) had 2 UL to discuss with but no chance for decisions or binding plans, and he soon left; alternate for a sick UL came, saw, and left; finally the observer left. Atypical or not, the IIC here seems to be a "general" sort of committee now, not responsible for actually guiding the instructional program. Quite a change from the IIC reported on last spring.

SUMMARY. Compared with the potential evident in late 1971-72, this school's participation has decreased markedly, and based upon the visit cannot be called a MUSE/IGE school. At best, it is marginal. This is not to say that good things are not happening here. They are. Teachers explore and experiment; a truly individualized math program is being implemented in one unit; the librarian sets a valuable tone in her domain; teachers have indeed become more independent of "the office" and make some decisions as unit groups; the IIC is scheduled to assist in interviewing new staff members; children appear productively involved.

However, there is no semblance of the instructional programming model here; the IIC appears to have dissipated its energies and functions; contact with the outside world of MUSE/IGE has ceased; there is little clear sense of direction about where--in IGE terms--this school is headed; the school program, except for open classrooms, looks to be strictly traditional.

- Active IIC...no
- Multiaging of students...no
- Operation of IGE subject...no
- Full unitization...yes and no

913

8. Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation. Please answer in terms of the 1972-73 school year.

| | YES | NO | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis? | X | | |
| (b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program? | X | | ? |
| 2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material? | X | | |
| (b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers? | X | | ?? |
| 3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)? | | X | |
| (b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program? | X | | |
| 4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?" | X | | |
| (b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal? | X | | |
| 5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)? | | X | |
| (b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children? | | X | |
| 6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program? | | X | |
| (b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches? | X | | |
| 7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time? | X | | |
| (b) Is it being implemented in all the units? | | X | |
| (c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject? | | X | |
| 8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching? | X | | |
| (b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?" | X | | |
| 9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units? | X | | |
| (b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit? | | X | |
| 10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model? | | X | |
| (b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units? | X | | ? |
| 11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure? | X | | ?? |
| (b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time? | X | | |
| 12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff? | | X | |
| (b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school since 6-72? | X | | |
| (c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance? | X | | ? |

Midyear: Four Most Serious Problem Areas Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Keeping records for student progress in IGE
2. Stating instructional objectives in behavioral terms
3. Multiage grouping in rooms, classes, or units
4. Assessment of students' achievement status/needs

**Thank you for your assistance.**

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina

School Number 203

The ½-hour IIC meeting was a disappointment. As was the case last year, it more resembled a "faculty announcement meeting" than anything close to the classical IIC. No instructional matters were considered; members sat at convenient distances from each other; the unwritten agenda included social events, PTA membership, and parent conferences; meeting dominated by P with virtually no interaction and no energy in evidenced by anyone. The apparent purpose of IIC here is to pass on to all teachers the matters discussed, announcements, problems, etc. (Prior to 1971-72 there had been a faculty advisory committee, and when MUSE came along the newly-appointed IIC asked to do "more than just instructional things" and took over previous "advisory" functions. This may explain the abortive IIC in this school).

The only topic of substance was scheduling parent conferences. It became clear that the whole matter was P's domain, including answering parent calls about rescheduling! UL's made a suggestion or two about conferences, but...

It is still not clear what the role of the "resource teachers" is. They don't seem to know. As one put it, "I'm a high-class aide, I guess. Frustrated. No, I'm not involved in IGE or multiunit, the others are." (Yet she's an IIC member). Besides her resource activities, she teaches in one unit; she teaches all subject-areas except her field of special preparation (math). Blames P, but P indicated that he blames superintendent. There is a real problem here in using personnel to best advantage, even aside from their involvement in the MUSE structure.

On the more positive side, (a) all classrooms and "open-space" units are multiaged, and all instruction is also. Two grade-levels per unit. It is planned to do what was done last year, in putting a few kids from grades 1-2 into the KG parttime; other than that, nothing more concrete in integrating Kg and primary...(b) the library is quite well-stocked (with much more than just books), and does serve many student needs for individual study, group study, reference, take-out, use of AV materials, instruction with aides, etc. Many childrer were observed moving freely in and out, and productively engaged while there. It is still NOT used by teachers as a resource for study-units or conferring with librarian. But it does serve children, and teachers increasingly permit them to use the library-IMC....(c) P reported improved relations in one unit of 4 teachers, where last year they hardly cooperated; now they at least teach/work in two pairs, so have two sub-units in effect....(d) in 5-6 unit, much instruction was observed in language arts; it appeared to be well-planned, well-controlled, and individualized. This unit works together very well, and their unit meeting was productive, though no agenda had been prepared. Members are in an open-space area, and were observed working together continuously.... (e) each unit decides how to assign instructional jobs; in one, 3 teachers manage science while in another just one teacher takes care of science alone... (f) regrouping with the WD was done last year by P and reading specialist; it is now the responsibility of each unit separately. All units have gone IGE with the WD in word attack skills, and so has the Kindergarten.

There are some falterings as well, however. Not all teachers teach the WD, and those who don't thereby do not identify themselves with IGE or overall MUSE/IGE purposes. This was quite clear here. Also, the 5-6 unit staffs

clearly assume that WD is meant for grades K-4, and any kids they have who are still in it are "leftovers," the kind who "should have finished it last year." This is of course inimical to the individualized instruction concept, and their attitudes show. P appears to share this notion about "slow students." Third, operation of sub-units may not be desirable; there is little evidence of unit planning or of combined teaching and responsibility in the units as a rule; rather, 1 teacher or 1-2 teachers plan, teach, group, etc.

Unfortunately, IGE in this school appears to be defined almost exclusively in terms of the Wisconsin Design in word attack skills. It is not conceived in broader terms (yet) and there is little evidence of teacher commitment to individualized instruction. (Another school in the district also has WD, but is not a MUSE/IGE school. It would be valuable to learn what the operational differences are between the two schools). Similarly, P pointed out that other schools in district are integrating some Kg's and primaries (and are not MUSE/IGE schools)....and again, one wonders what the differences are. And why can't it be made to work better in this school?

SUMMARY: This appeared to be a marginal MUSE/IGE school in 1971-72. It still does, although this report is intended to make clear that at midyear it was stronger than school number 913. Here, the IIC is more a vestigial body representing a committee which does not deal much with substantive matters; P dominates as before. There is a considerable amount of resistance to IGE, its extension to other subjects, MUSE, and the P; this appears best explained by a continuing weak relationship between P and staff. And there are several indications of minimal teamwork in the units. On the other hand, IGE is functioning along program-model lines in the Wisconsin Design, and in two units there is a good working relationship among teachers. Moreover, the library/IMC is functioning quite well as a learning resource center.

P appears committed and sincere, but holds quite tight reins on the staff. He seems reluctant to share decision-making, especially at the IIC level, though there are signs that units this year have more responsibility and latitude. A major problem is the underuse of "resource teachers" (who still are paid more than the UL), and another is within-school communication.

Active IIC....no
Multiaging of students....yes
Operation of IGE subject-area....yes
Full unitization....no

8. Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation. Please answer in terms of the 1972-73 school year.

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis? | ✓ | |
| (b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program? | ✓ | |
| 2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material? | ✓ | |
| (b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers? | ✓ | |
| 3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)? | | ✓ |
| (b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program? | ✓ | |
| 4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?" | ✓ | |
| (b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal? | ✓ | |
| 5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)? | ✓ | |
| (b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children? | ✓ | |
| 6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program? | ✓ | |
| (b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches? | ✓ | |
| 7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time? | ✓ | |
| (b) Is it being implemented in <u>all</u> the units? | ✓ | |
| (c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject? | ✓ | |
| 8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching? | ✓ | |
| (b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?" | ✓ | |
| 9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units? | | ✓ |
| (b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit? | | ✓ |
| 10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model? | | ✓ |
| (b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units? | ✓ | |
| 11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure? | 1/2 | 1/2 |
| (b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time? | ✓ | |
| 12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff? | ✓ | |
| (b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school since 6-72? | ✓ | |
| (c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance? | ✓ | |

Four Most Serious Problem Areas Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Keeping records and recording student progress
2. Instructional objectives in behavioral terms
3. Time available for planning
4. Time for inservice training

Thank you for your assistance.

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina

School Number 603

A visit in early 1971-72 revealed a well-organized IIC, a beautiful example of a productive IIC meeting, considerable evidence of staff commitment (particularly to individualization), P-staff interaction, and good attitudes toward the need for planning. The school had benefited by earlier association with a college project in which a few of its teachers received special attention in re team operations and individualization. (At the same time it took on MUSE/IGE, it continued with the college project and also moved toward full integration of a school population approximately 70% black). The library was that; it could not be called an IMC in the full-resource sense.

The IGE attempt at that time was in language arts, but not in a systematic way. There was some individualized instruction, but no record-keeping, no assessment, no specific objectives. The attitude was appropriate, but the means were weak. All classrooms were on a grade-level basis, as were units; though for 2 units walls had been removed in order to allow for a flow of activities.

* * * * * * *

The midyear 1972-73 visit found the situation much the same as before. The atmosphere was that of a "good place to be," the units operated as working teams, efforts were continuing to put language arts into the IGE mold, staff appeared committed, and there were several indications of meaningful inservice training as well as continued staff-P interaction and respect. A district supervisor was visiting, and corroborated much that both P said and the observer noted. Quite obviously, the supervisor has had a continuing hand in the development of this school's program.

At this time, the school population is about 60% black, the result of the "return" of many whites who had left the year before. P and some staff credited the atmosphere created by MUSE/IGE for this change in ratio; also noted that white parents had visited and SEEN that the program was "good" and that indeed some efforts were made to individualize instruction in 1971-72. It should be added that at the time of the midyear visit, every room, unit, sub-group, and ability group had white and black children (working together); there was no evidence of racial separation once the children entered the desegregated school. The same may be said for teachers.

Not possible to observe an IIC meeting. But visitor inferred a healthy and active IIC from (a) study of the log, (b) interviews, and (c) noting numerous matters of instructional moment in the weekly agendas of recent months.

Units are still organized strictly by separate grade-levels. Appears to be some staff resistance to multiaging notion, as well as quite thorough lack of ideas on "how to do it, if it is a good idea." (Visitor provided some ideas and resource suggestions on multiaging). P acknowledged lack of confidence in own ability to make it work, but saw "value of it." The net result is that all instruction is to single-age groups, and teachers stick with the same materials, books, and plans they have always had. There is security in that.

P explained that "next year we will begin multiaging by retaining students." They plan to reassign some kids to the same unit. Selection would be on basis of those needing further instruction. Apparently the UL were given task of discussing this in the units and coming up with ideas, for the meeting of Unit 3 was devoted to this topic. (A well-managed, productive meeting, with participation by UL, 2 teachers, 1 aide, and 2 student teachers). Topic was approached not as foregone conclusion, but as something to probe about. The model which resulted: kid would be retained in grade (unit) 3 for say, the first semester of following year. By then he would have "caught up with his grade" and then be moved to unit (grade) 4. At which time he would proceed in that unit. No thought was given to likelihood that such a child would already be behind in the unit 4 work (by half a year at least), since the whole point here was to find some way to multiage children.

There is, to repeat, some resistance to the notion of wholesale multiaging.

P attended part of this meeting, and acted only as resource when called upon. Meeting considered above topic; also quick discussion of printed minutes of previous IIC meeting; also placement of new child--good group process in the needed decisions; and announcements from the IIC.

One problem area is the library. It has a plentiful supply of books and reference materials (and some AV equipment), but is used primarily by classroom groups for (a) library instruction or (b) book selection. A few children were observed using materials freely, on an in-and-out basis. Librarian's attitude is expressed in this remark, "If I have a class in here, I can't be bothered by an individual who comes in for reference or has a question."

The IGE subject here is language arts; instruction does not follow the programing model, however. (Staff considering a structured math program for next year, and this would be excellent choice...since it is so developed as to fit the model very nicely). Instruction was observed in language arts, math, and history in various classrooms, and it may be said that small-group instruction prevailed in somewhat free-floating atmosphere, where teachers, student-teachers, and aides constantly moved about giving help or direction. (A couple of very weak teaching situations were also observed, but the above was the norm). Since three units have double-room areas, it was possible to observe 45 to 70 children being taught at same time, each subgroup effectively ignoring the others for the most part, and teachers obviously proceeding by plans, not whims.

In addition, efforts made to IGE in reading. ABC's "READ" program is in use, but, as the supervisor noted, "not the assessment or diagnostic part. They have trouble with that kind of an idea."

SUMMARY. This report makes clear that School Number 603 has maintained both the successes and difficulties of 1971-72, and in addition appears to deserve a prognosis of continued MUSE/IGE development. While grade-level instruction is the rule here, such instruction is conducted via team planning and sharing as well as various groupings which change periodically. While the programing model is not being followed, introduction of a systematic math program next year may provide the example needed for this staff. Moreover, staff relationships are good, the IIC is apparently functioning adequately, and units have developed good working procedures for both planning and teaching. They "think as units" and do not just "go ask the principal."

Active IIC....yes
Multiaging of students....no
Operation of IGE subject...yes and no
Full unitization...yes

603

8. Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation. Please answer in terms of the 1972-73 school year.

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis? | ✓ | |
| (b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program? | ✓ | |
| 2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material? | ✓ | |
| (b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers? | ✓ | |
| 3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)? | ✓ | |
| (b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program? | ✓ | |
| 4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?" | ✓ | |
| (b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal? | ✓ | |
| 5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)? | | ✓ |
| (b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children? | | ✓ |
| 6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program? | ✓ | |
| (b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches? | ✓ | |
| 7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time? | ✓ | |
| (b) Is it being implemented in <u>all</u> the units? | ✓ | |
| (c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject? | ✓ | |
| 8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching? | ✓ | |
| (b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?" | ✓ | |
| 9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units? | ✓ | |
| (b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit? | ✓ | |
| 10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model? | ✓ | |
| (b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units? | ✓ | |
| 11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure? | ✓ | |
| (b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time? | ✓ | |
| 12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff? | ✓ | |
| (b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school since 6-72? | ✓ | |
| (c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance? | ✓ | |

Midyear:

| Four Most Serious Problem Areas Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire |
|---|

1. Multiage grouping
2. Level of support from District
3. Time available for planning
4. Costs for staff, materials, training

Thank you for your assistance.

Educational Testing Service Durham North Carolina

## Chapter V

## The Follow-up Picture

It seems quite clear that virtually all of the schools which responded to the follow-up instruments--regardless of their reported dates of installation--may be counted as participating in the MUSE/IGE innovations as of the 1972-73 midyear point. It is equally clear, however, that such a statement implies "participating at varying levels of implementation progress." These schools identify themselves, through the principal and the IIC, with the MUSE and IGE patterns regardless of the extent to which they have fulfilled the implementation criteria provided in the guidelines. That of course is not "bad," but it does mean that the term "MUSE/IGE school" does not have precise referents in actual practice. Some schools have emphasized the MUSE structure over the IGE instructional process (and the converse is true), while even within each of those domains wide differences exist in actual status at the midyear point.

The differences referred to above and throughout this report do not apply only where installing schools of September 1971 are contrasted with those of September 1972. They apply equally within the September 1971 group, and for that reason they suggest several important questions about the implementation process and about expected status after a year's exposure and experience. One wonders whether certain components are inherently more difficult to implement than others, for example, and further, whether this possibility may have been taken into account in the whole installation project. Apparently most schools proceeded by attempting to initiate the basic elements which had been advocated, but many of them either did not fully understand what was required or else tried to implement and had minimal success. For example, it was calculated that among the 56 IIC returns from the 9-71/1-72 installation group, 8 schools had not--by midyear--instituted a regular and active IIC; this was based on their actual entries, not on the interpreters' inferences. Moreover, 4 schools were still not multiaged, 8 were not fully unitized (excluding cases where the Kg was separate), and fully 14 indicated that they were not implementing the IGE instructional programing model. In a few cases, those data reflected backward steps as compared with May 1972 reports from those same schools.

The point here--the question--is to what extent these basic and specific criteria may be employed either as (a) requirements for the initial period of

implementation or as (b) indicators of satisfactory implementation status at a later point. What is it that makes a MUSE/IGE school? Can a school proceed satisfactorily with individualized education without having all of the MUSE components in operation? What accounts for the fact that schools report attritions from their earlier 1971-72 status in a number of important MUSE and/or IGE features? And when that happens, may the school still be acknowledged as a MUSE/IGE school? And when that happens, is that a signal for the need of technical assistance?

We do not have or propose answers to those questions. But certainly the follow-up activity has emphasized the importance of asking them, and of recommending further developmental efforts (and study of existing data) which might shed light on these matters.

This seems such an important problem, from both theoretical and practical points of view, that we calculated other reported statuses in the 4 basic implementation criteria (active IIC, multiaged units, IGE subject using the model, and full unitization). Among the 56 schools which implemented in 1971-72, it was found that at midyear 20 schools reported having 3 of the 4 features; 4 schools reported 2 of these characteristics and partially a 3rd; 2 schools had 2 features; and 2 other schools reported only 1. Even these data are artifactual to an extent, since we know that "having multiaged units" does not necessarily mean that instruction itself is multiaged, and that "following the IGE instructional model" often means employing parts of the model.

The foregoing puts emphasis on the schools which now are in their second year of participation. The same questions may be raised about implementation undertaken by later groups, notably the 9-72 group of schools. As noted in Chapter III, their status--in terms of the same basic summary questions--was at about the same percentage level as for earlier groups; and it may be anticipated that later fulfillment may present some hurdles for these schools as well.

It can be said, however, that the 9-72 group did initiate the MUSE/IGE implementation, and thereby did follow through on 1971-72 intentions. The only case of outright attrition from the patterns was in this group, and has been referred to before; the school simply did not get off the ground in its installation efforts.

But were there other cases of attrition? This is difficult to answer since our experience to this point tells us that such a decision almost inevitably requires a site visit. (The converse may be posited as well,

that visits are necessary in order to discern evidence that a school is maintaining a high implementation status). Questionnaire items at this time are not subtle enough to permit firm conclusions even when the instruments have been completed and "look" and "feel" accurate as well as thorough. Midyear site-visits suggest that one school from the 9-71 group has maintained a low level of criterion-attainment, and that a school from the 4-72 group has done some backsliding of a considerable sort. A third visit evidenced maintainence of a "good" status as well as intimations that progress may be expected. The follow-up study, in its entirety, does suggest the need for further refinement of monitoring instruments so that they may be sensitive to actual status and can replace to an extent the need for multiple site-visits.

Beyond the conclusions summarized in Chapter I, another appears obvious: the follow-up study verifies the admonition that MUSE/IGE implementation may take 3 or 4 years (in terms of local satisfaction and in terms of fulfilling the many implementation criteria). Some school people, researchers, and coordinators have perhaps hoped that the major hurdles could be mastered in the first year by most schools; this appears a questionable assumption at best, in view of the data reported here. And as noted repeatedly in this report, one major area of difficulty and concern has been the IGE instructional programing model...and <u>it</u> is at the very heart of the individualized education which schools are attempting to promote. IIC's and principals indicated in various ways their problems with actual implementation of the model, and also expressed the need for technical assistance in doing so. Many also noted that staffs need constant reaquaintance with the <u>concepts</u> of individualization, the rationale underlying the model.

* * * * * *

It is not the intent of this report to sound a pessimistic note. In fact, it may be that the follow-up findings (or at least many of them) can be put to constructive use by outlining to school people certain reasonable expectations they should entertain as they adopt the MUSE and IGE patterns. It is clearly not enough to have good intentions or to take on labels. In addition, it is hoped that coordinators will discover value in some of the feedback contained in the report, which may provide clues as to technical assistance needs and at the same time outline the particular aspects of implementation status in which they are most interested.

Most importantly, perhaps, the report leads to certain questions about implementation criteria and their essential nature in the total plan. It also raises questions concerning the permanence of certain changes, the inevitability of successive approximation in fulfilling the criteria, definitions of acceptable practices in MUSE and IGE, and the need for additional inputs to make the innovations take permanent hold. These are questions which may be addressed by individuals or agencies which are in a position to pursue them.

# A P P E N D I X  A

Follow-up Questionnaires

Principal - Green
The IIC - White

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

# QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PRINCIPAL

As a follow-up into the 1972-73 school year, we are requesting that IIC's and Principals complete very brief instruments concerning present status, plans, and perceived needs relative to the MUSE/IGE implementation. Items and questions are excerpted from the longer instruments completed last year; they should be answered now in terms of the present: December 1972.

An addressed and post-paid envelope is enclosed for your use. Please complete and return the questionnaire within two weeks. Thank you for your help.

1. RATING UNIT LEADERS ON VARIOUS ROLE ASPECTS.
Considering activities and performance at this time, please indicate the number of unit leaders you would rank as doing poorly, adequately, and well. For example, assuming 5 unit leaders, you might rate them on a given task in this way: 1 performs poorly, 2 adequately, and 2 well.

Total Number of Unit Leaders: ____

| | POORLY | ADE-QUATELY | WELL |
|---|---|---|---|
| (a) Is efficient in discovering and utilizing resources: staff, space, materials, assistance | | | |
| (b) Performs liaison functions between the unit (its concerns & needs) and the IIC and principal | | | |
| (c) Assists interns, student-teachers, aides, and new teachers in their unit roles | | | |
| (d) Evokes positive attitudes toward new methods, and new materials, and curricular & instructional changes | | | |
| (e) Plans and carries out the instructional program in the unit for the IGE subject(s) | | | |
| (f) Maintains effective communication with parents | | | |
| (g) Conducts constructive unit meetings, including planning, in-service, problem solving | | | |
| (h) Contributes meaningfully (through the IIC) to the educational program of the whole school | | | |
| (i) Demonstrates and practices good teaching approaches | | | |
| (j) Makes use of opportunities to perfect his/her skills | | | |
| (k) Monitors and coordinates all the aspects of the unit as a "school within the school" | | | |

2. Were you principal of this school in 1970-71? ____ in 1971-72? ____

3. Became multiunit/IGE school in [9-71] [2-72] [9-72] [Other ___-7__]

4. Please try to describe the present general feeling and attitude of the total staff toward the multiunit organization (MUSE) and toward individually guided education (IGE)--as you see it now. Please enter rough percentages of the staff in any or all of the 4 categories (to the nearest 5%).

| | Cautious | Neutral | Agreeable | Enthusiastic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GENERAL FEELING TOWARD MUSE... | % | % | % | % | 100% |
| GENERAL FEELING TOWARD IGE.... | % | % | % | % | 100% |

5. How do you define the "beginning point" of your installation of MUSE/IGE? That is, what event or circumstance marks the point before which you were in the planning and preparation period but after which you would say that your school was actually a "MUSE/IGE school?" Please check one choice below, or indicate a more precise one under "Other."

___ (a) Decision by school staff to be committed to MUSE/IGE
___ (b) Selection of the Unit Leaders
___ (c) First regular meeting of the IIC
___ (d) Choice of subject-area(s) for IGE
___ (e) Organization of teachers and students into functioning units
___ (f) Initiation of the Wisconsin Reading Design: assessment of pupil status
___ (g) Initiation of other individualized curriculum: assessment of pupil status
___ (h) Preschool Workshop for the school staff
___ (i) Development of the IMC or Learning Center or Media Center
___ (j) Initiation of in-service training
___ (k) Initiation of team functions (planning, sharing, teaching) in the units
___ (l) Delineation of general or specific objectives in IGE subject-area(s)

___ (m) (Other) _____

6. From your point of view as Principal, which of the following have given particular difficulty this year in implementing MUSE/IGE? Please check all applicable items, but only if these have been continuing or serious problems to effective implementation.

___ (a) Ineffective leadership of some or all unit leaders
___ (b) Confusion over roles and responsibilities
___ (c) Teachers working too hard and long; "burn-out"
___ (d) A sizable number of teachers not fully committed to MUSE and IGE
___ (e) Availability of effective consulting assistance from outside the school
___ (f) Resistance to idea of teaching multiage groups of students
___ (g) Problems in teamwork, planning, & sharing within any or all units
___ (h) Departmentalization of instruction in the units
___ (i) Problems in communication in the school: between units; access to the principal; teachers and the IIC; staff meetings; attitudes
___ (j) Problems in IMC: materials, staffing, space, and accessibility
___ (k) Problems in in-service training: content, frequency, time, relevance
___ (l) Competition among the units

___ (m) (Other) _____

7. All things considered, if you could set up a workshop of your own devising right now--concerned with MUSE/IGE installation and refinement--

(a) What would its purpose and topic be?

_____

_____

(b) For whom would it be held? That is, who would be the "audience?"

_____

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE IIC
(as a group activity)

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

As a follow-up into the 1972-73 school year, we are requesting that IIC's and Principals complete very brief instruments concerning present status, plans, and perceived needs related to the MUSE/IGE implementation. Items and questions are excerpted from the longer instruments completed last year; they should be answered now in terms of the present: December 1972.

Please involve only regular IIC members in completing the form, and may we suggest that it be done as part of an IIC meeting. Time required: 10-15 minutes.

An addressed and post-paid envelope is enclosed for your use. Please complete and return the questionnaire within two weeks of receipt, and sooner if possible.

1. a. The IIC regularly meets for _____ hours per week.

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| b. Are these meetings regularly scheduled at a given time?..... | | |
| c. Is an agenda regularly prepared for IIC Meetings?..... | | |
| If YES, is it printed and distributed in advance?..... | | |
| d. Does the IIC keep a formal log or set of minutes?..... | | |
| e. Are minutes or reports of IIC meetings generally distributed after the weekly meetings?..... | | |
| f. Do you sometimes request non-IIC members (of the school staff) to attend IIC meetings?..... | | |

g. When was the IIC set up? (month & year) _____ 19____

h. When did the IIC actually begin functioning as the "governing group" for the school's instructional program? _____ 19 _____

2. Roughly what percentage of IIC time has been devoted to the following broad activities so far this year? (To the nearest 5%).

___ (a) Monitoring IGE implementation in the school and evaluating progress
___ (b) Dealing with, explaining to, or getting support of--parents
___ (c) Aiding the units in instructional programing in IGE subject(s), and related assistance such as materials and recording pupil progress
___ (d) Planning and arranging in-service training for the whole staff
___ (e) General management of the school and personnel relations
___ (f) Planning (of all sorts) for 1972-73 and 1973-74 operations.

____ (g) (Other) _____

100%

3. Many have expressed a need for "technical assistance" in accomplishing MUSE/IGE implementation--above and beyond the personnel, financial, materials, or other supportive requirements they may have. What are the 3 or 4 most pressing technical-assistance needs at your school?
(use space below and at bottom of page 2)

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Any or all of the following topics may present problems to a school in the process of embracing and implementing MUSE and IGE patterns. This wide range is based on feedback from schools engaged in implementation. As the IIC group, please consider which of these have been really nettlesome during this school year--items which have presented troublesome obstacles to a smooth MUSE/IGE implementation.

Then, choose the FOUR of those items that have been the most serious in your school's implementation this year, and mark those four in the column shown. Please check no more than 4 items.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Keeping records and recording student progress for IGE | |
| 2. Stating instructional objectives in behavioral terms | |
| 3. Grouping students for instruction | |
| 4. Multiage grouping in rooms, classes, or units | |
| 5. Assessment of students' achievement status and needs | |
| 6. Working on two or more IGE subjects | |
| 7. Implementing the IGE instructional programing model | |
| 8. Teaching all the various sizes of instructional groups | |
| 9. Level of support/cooperation from parents | |
| 10. Level of support/cooperation from district personnel | |
| 11. Reporting and explaining to parents & community | |
| 12. Overall school schedules and separate unit schedules | |
| 13. Time available for planning, grouping, evaluating, & preparation--in the units | |
| 14. Teachers knowing & working with up to 150 students | |
| 15. Costs for staff, materials, construction, training | |
| 16. Time for in-service training | |
| 17. Coordination of use of space, materials, staff | |
| 18. Roles and responsibilities of aides | |
| 19. Daily moving of students & teachers within units | |
| 20. Discipline, noise, confusion | |
| 21. Nature of the building(s); layout; space; doors | |
| 22. Materials and equipment in the IMC/library | |
| 23. Location of IMC/library; accessibility & size | |
| 24. Outside assistance for consultation & in-service | |
| 25. Supply of large variety of teaching materials | |
| 26. Size of unit staffs | |
| 27. Children's adjustments to the new routines | |
| 28. Scheduling special teachers (art, phys. ed, etc.) into the instructional programs of the units | |
| 29. (Other | |
| 30. (Other) | |

5. Has your school--AT ANY TIME--developed an overall MUSE/IGE "implementation timetable?". . . . . Yes___ No___

If YES, a) When was this formally done? _____ 19 ___
b) Has it since been revised? . . . . . Yes___ No___

6. Do you consider that your school is an active member of a linkage group of MUSE/IGE schools (pact, league, network, sub-league)? . . Yes___ No___

If YES, in general does the IIC feel that this association is of value to the school? . . . . . Yes___ No___

7. UNIT ORGANIZATION

(a) How many regular instructional units are organized at this time?_____

(b) Do these units include all students in the school?. . . . Yes___ No___

If NO, please explain the "exceptions."

_____

_____

(c) Is there any unit that does not have an IGE subject?. . . Yes___ No___

(d) PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR EACH UNIT: (Most items can be answered with a Yes or No).

| Units ⟶ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade-equivalents in the unit | | | | | | | |
| How much weekly unit-meeting time (hours) | | | | | | | |
| Regrouping for IGE subject(s) typically occurs (weeks) | | | | | | | |
| How many formalized IGE subjects in unit? | | | | | | | |
| Do you consider the unit to be multiaged? | | | | | | | |
| Is instruction for IGE subject(s) multiaged? | | | | | | | |
| Is OTHER regular instruction multiaged? | | | | | | | |
| Is agenda typically prepared for unit meetings? | | | | | | | |
| Are unit-meetings sometimes used for formal inservice in the unit? | | | | | | | |
| Do all unit teachers teach the IGE subject(s)? | | | | | | | |
| Is periodic assessment in IGE subject(s) done by formal test techniques? | | | | | | | |
| Is periodic assessment done by "general teacher judgement"? | | | | | | | |

8. Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation. Please answer in terms of the 1972-73 school year.

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?..... | | |
| (b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?..... | | |
| 2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?..... | | |
| (b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?..... | | |
| 3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?..... | | |
| (b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?..... | | |
| 4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?"..... | | |
| (b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?... | | |
| 5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?..... | | |
| (b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?..... | | |
| 6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?..... | | |
| (b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?..... | | |
| 7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?..... | | |
| (b) Is it being implemented in <u>all</u> the units?..... | | |
| (c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?..... | | |
| 8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?..... | | |
| (b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?"..... | | |
| 9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?..... | | |
| (b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?..... | | |
| 10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?..... | | |
| (b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?..... | | |
| 11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?..... | | |
| (b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?..... | | |
| 12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?..... | | |
| (b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school since 6-72?..... | | |
| (c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?..... | | |

Thank you for your assistance.

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina

# APPENDIX B

Tables for the Principal Instrument

P

Table P-1

Principals' Definition of "Beginning Point" of MUSE/IGE Installation

| | 9-71 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|
| N's... | 57 | 8 | 14 |
| | N % | N % | N % |
| Organization of teachers and students into functioning units | 12-21 | 1-12 | |
| Decision by school staff to be committed to MUSE/IGE | 13-23 | 5-62 | 4-28 |
| Preschool Workshop for the school staff | 4- 7 | | 1- 7 |
| Initiation of the Wisconsin Reading Design: assessment | 5- 9 | | 3-21 |
| Initiation of team functions (planning, sharing, teaching) | 9-16 | 1-12 | 2-14 |
| Selection of the Unit Leaders | 3- 5 | | |
| Initiation of other individualized curriculum: assessment | 2- 4 | | |
| First regular meeting of the IIC | 1- 2 | | 1- 7 |
| Development of the IMC or Learning Center or Media Center | 1- 2 | | |
| Initiation of in-service training | 3- 5 | | 1- 7 |
| Choice of subject-area(s) for IGE | | | |
| Delineation of general or specific objectives in IGE subject | | | |
| Principal's initial training | 2- 4 | | |
| Superintendent's decision to enroll | | | 1- 7 |
| Decision by the IIC "to go" | | | |
| (Multiple response or no response) | 2- 4 | 1-12 | 1- 7 |

Continuing Serious Problems as Installation Obstacles (from principals' point of view)

Table P-2

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ineffective leadership of some or all unit leaders | 13-23 | 2-25 | 5-36 |
| Confusion over new roles and responsibilities | 12-21 | 1-12 | 5-36 |
| Teachers working too hard and long; "burn-out" | 23-40 | 4-50 | 9-64 |
| A sizable number of teachers not fully committed to MUSE and IGE | 7-12 | 3-38 | 1- 7 |
| Lack of effective consulting assistance from outside the school | 13-23 | 4-50 | 5-36 |
| Resistance to idea of teaching multiage groups of students | 4- 7 | 2-25 | 5-36 |
| Problems in teamwork, planning, & sharing in any or all units | 13-23 | 4-50 | 5-36 |
| Departmentalization of instruction in the units | 8-14 | 1-12 | 3-36 |
| Problems in school communication: between units; access to the principal; teachers and the IIC; staff meetings; attitudes | 5- 9 | | 5-36 |
| Problems in IMC: materials, staffing, space, and accessibility | 12-21 | 1-12 | 4-28 |
| Problems in in-service: content, frequency, time, relevance | 14-24 | 2-25 | 5-36 |
| Competition among the units | 3- 5 | | 2-14 |
| Inadequate time for unit planning | 3- 5 | 2-25 | 1- 7 |
| Pupil mobility through the year | | | |
| Parent disapproval or lack of support | | | |
| Some teachers resist role of the unit leader | 1- 2 | | 1- 7 |
| Costs for materials, supplies, aides | | | |
| Have no aides | 3- 5 | | |
| Have too few materials and other facilities | 2- 4 | | 2-14 |
| No one to compare notes with; need moral support | 1- 2 | | |
| Deal with multiaged groups | | 1-12 | |
| Time for IIC meetings | 1- 2 | | |
| Scheduling special subjects | 2- 4 | | |
| Other programs imposed by District | 1- 2 | | |
| Getting new (untrained) unit teachers | 1- 2 | | |
| Trying to seriously implement programing model | | 1-12 | |

P

Table P-3

## Principals' Assessments of Staff Attitudes By Any Entries in Given Patterns

| Response Category | | | | | 9-71 + 1-72 | | 4-72 | | 9-72 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | N's... 57 | | 8 | | 14 | |
| | CAUTIOUS | NEUTRAL | AGREEABLE | ENTHUSIASTIC | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 1. | X | X | X | X | 22 | 38 | 2 | 25 | 8 | 57 |
| 2. | X | X | X | | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 7 |
| 3. | X | X | | X | | | | | 1 | 7 |
| 4. | X | | X | X | 7 | 12 | 1 | 12 | | |
| 5. | | X | X | X | 4 | 7 | | | | |
| 6. | | X | X | | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 7 |
| 7. | | | X | | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| 8. | | | X | X | 16 | 27 | 4 | 50 | 1 | 7 |
| 9. | | | | X | 5 | 9 | | | 1 | 7 |
| 10. | X | | | X | | | 1 | 12 | 1 | 7 |

Table P-4

## Principals' Assessments of Staff Attitudes By Percentage Ranges and Means

| | | CAUTIOUS | NEUTRAL | AGREEABLE | ENTHUSIASTIC | Groups |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MUSE | Mean % | 5 | 7 | 29 | 59 | 9-71 + 1-72 N=57 |
| | % Range | 0-30 | 0-40 | 0-80 | 0-100 | |
| IGE | Mean % | 5 | 6 | 29 | 60 | |
| | % Range | 0-20 | 0-40 | 0-85 | 0-100 | |
| MUSE | Mean % | 7 | 5 | 44 | 44 | 4-72 N=8 |
| | % Range | 0-50 | 0-25 | 0-100 | 0-85 | |
| IGE | Mean % | 7 | 4 | 42 | 47 | |
| | % Range | 0-80 | 0-20 | 0-100 | 10-100 | |
| MUSE | Mean % | 9 | 12 | 37 | 42 | 9-72 N=14 |
| | % Range | 0-25 | 0-50 | 0-85 | 0-100 | |
| IGE | Mean % | 12 | 10 | 33 | 45 | |
| | % Range | 0-40 | 0-40 | 0-80 | 0-100 | |

P

Table P-5

Principals' Ratings of Unit Leader Performance
(for 14 schools installing 9-72)

Unit Leader Total = 46

| | Poorly | | Adequately | | Well | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (a) Is efficient in discovering and utilizing resources: staff, space, materials, assistance | 1- | 2 | 22- | 48 | 23- | 50 |
| (b) Performs liaison functions between the unit (its concerns & needs) and the IIC and principal | 3- | 6 | 17- | 37 | 26- | 56 |
| (c) Assists interns, student-teachers, aides, and new teachers in their unit roles | 1- | 2 | 23- | 50 | 22- | 48 |
| (d) Evokes positive attitudes toward new methods, and new materials, and curricular & instructional changes | 2- | 4 | 20- | 43 | 24- | 52 |
| (e) Plans and carries out the instructional program in the unit for the IGE subject(s) | 1- | 2 | 28- | 61 | 17- | 37 |
| (f) Maintains effective communication with parents | 7- | 15 | 19- | 41 | 20- | 43 |
| (g) Conducts constructive unit meetings, including planning, in-service, problem solving | 3- | 6 | 22- | 48 | 21- | 46 |
| (h) Contributes meaningfully (through the IIC) to the educational program of the whole school | | | 19- | 41 | 27- | 59 |
| (i) Demonstrates and practices good teaching approaches | | | 21- | 46 | 25- | 54 |
| (j) Makes use of opportunities to perfect his/her skills | 2- | 4 | 21- | 46 | 23- | 50 |
| (k) Monitors and coordinates all the aspects of the unit as a "school within the school" | 7- | 15 | 19- | 41 | 20- | 43 |

Table P-6

Topics for High-Priority Staff Workshops
Needed as of Midyear 1972-73

| | 9-71 + 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|
| N's... | 57 | 8 | 14 |
| | N | N | N |
| Group processes: relationships, sharing, decision-making | 12 | 2 | 2 |
| REVIEW of the concepts of individualization | 6 | 2 | |
| Develop performance objectives for IGE subject-area | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Review instructional programing model procedures: HOW TO | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Define roles & responsibilities in units and/or IIC | 2 | | 3 |
| Translate a given curriculum into IGE terms | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| How to group and regroup | 2 | 1 | |
| Develop assessment tools for students | 3 | | |
| Plan for multiage instruction | 3 | | |
| Develop enthusiasm and insights for the programing model | 2 | | 1 |
| Improved communications among all school-related groups | 2 | | 1 |
| Instructional materials/activities for skill development | 4 | | 1 |
| How to adjust to different learning styles | 2 | | |
| How to find planning time | 2 | | 1 |
| Organize an IIC in our school | 1 | | |
| Evaluate our progress and problems | 1 | | |
| Study the flexibile nature of MUSE | 1 | | |
| Not needed | 1 | | 1 |

# APPENDIX C

## Tables for the IIC Instrument

IIC

Table I-1

Number of IIC's Reporting any Proportion of Time Spent on Specific IIC Functions

| Response Category | Installation Groups: 9-71 + 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|
| N's | 54 | 8 | 12 |
| | N % | N % | N % |
| Monitor IGE & evaluate progress | 52-96 | 5-62 | 10-83 |
| Deal with, explain to, parents | 45-83 | 6-75 | 10-83 |
| Aid units (IGE, materials, records) | 49-91 | 6-75 | 10-83 |
| Plan, arrange schoolwide inservice | 41-76 | 6-75 | 9-75 |
| Manage school, and personnel relations | 50-92 | 8-100 | 10-83 |
| Plan for MUSE/IGE in 1973-74 | 51-94 | 8-100 | 11-92 |

Major Implementation Obstacles Noted by IIC's (4 most serious)

Table I-2

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Keeping records and recording student progress for IGE | 18-33 | 4-50 | 4-33 |
| 2. Stating instructional objectives in behavioral terms | 9-17 | 1-12 | |
| 3. Grouping students for instruction | 7-13 | 1-12 | 4-33 |
| 4. Multiage grouping in rooms, classes, or units | 6-11 | 3-38 | 2-17 |
| 5. Assessment of students' achievement status and needs | 6-11 | 1-12 | 2-17 |
| 6. Working on two or more IGE subjects | 10-18 | 1-12 | 2-17 |
| 7. Implementing the IGE instructional programing model | 6-11 | | 1- 8 |
| 8. Teaching all the various sizes of instructional groups | 7-13 | | |
| 9. Level of support/cooperation from parents | 1- 2 | | |
| 10. Level of support/cooperation from district personnel | 8-15 | 1-12 | 1- 8 |
| 11. Reporting and explaining to parents & community | 6-11 | 1-12 | |
| 12. Overall school schedules and separate unit schedules | 13-24 | 3-38 | 1- 8 |
| 13. Time available for planning, grouping, evaluating, & preparation--in the units | 34-63 | 4-50 | 6-50 |
| 14. Teachers knowing & working with up to 150 students | 5- 9 | 1-12 | 1- 8 |
| 15. Costs for staff, materials, construction, training | 9-17 | 2-25 | 3-25 |
| 16. Time for in-service training | 10-18 | 2-25 | 2-17 |
| 17. Coordination of use of space, materials, staff | 6-11 | | 4-33 |
| 18. Roles and responsibilities of aides | 1- 2 | | 1- 8 |
| 19. Daily moving of students & teachers within units | 3- 6 | | 1- 8 |
| 20. Discipline, noise, confusion | 6-11 | 2-25 | 3-25 |
| 21. Nature of the building(s); layout; space; doors | 6-11 | 1-12 | 1- 8 |
| 22. Materials and equipment in the IMC/library | 6-11 | | |
| 23. Location of IMC/library; accessibility & size | 5- 9 | | 2-17 |
| 24. Outside assistance for consultation & in-service | 5- 9 | 2-25 | 1- 8 |
| 25. Supply of large variety of teaching materials | 7-13 | | |
| 26. Size of unit staffs | 4- 7 | | 1- 8 |
| 27. Children's adjustments to the new routines | 1- 2 | 1-12 | |
| 28. Scheduling special teachers (art, phys. ed, etc.) into the instructional programs of the units | 12-22 | 1-12 | 2-17 |
| Other | 7-13 | 1-12 | 5-42 |

IIC

## Characteristics of the IIC Meeting

Table I-3

| Response Category | | | Installation Groups: 9-71 + 1-72 N | % | 4-72 N | % | 9-72 N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N's | 54 | | 8 | | 12 | |
| --IIC regularly meets ___ hours per week | Indefinite | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 8 |
| | 1/2 hour | | 4 | 7 | | | 1 | 8 |
| | 1 | | 19 | 35 | 4 | 50 | 6 | 50 |
| | 1-1/2 | | 13 | 24 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 8 |
| | 2 | | 10 | 18 | 2 | 25 | 2 | 17 |
| | 2-1/2 | | 4 | 7 | | | | |
| | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | 4 | | | | | | 1 | 8 |
| --Regularly scheduled at given time? | | YES | 49 | 91 | 7 | 88 | 7 | 58 |
| | | NO | 4 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 42 |
| --Agenda regularly prepared? | | YES | 45 | 83 | 7 | 88 | 8 | 67 |
| | | NO | 9 | 17 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 33 |
| --(If YES), agenda distributed in advance? | | YES | 26 | -- | 6 | -- | 6 | -- |
| | | NO | 19 | -- | 1 | -- | 2 | -- |
| --Formal log, minutes kept? | | YES | 35 | 65 | 6 | 75 | 6 | 50 |
| | | NO | 18 | 33 | 2 | 25 | 6 | 50 |
| --Minutes generally distributed after meetings? | | YES | 37 | 69 | 5 | 62 | 4 | 33 |
| | | NO | 17 | 31 | 3 | 38 | 8 | 67 |
| --Non-IIC members sometimes requested to attend? | | YES | 47 | 87 | 7 | 88 | 10 | 83 |
| | | NO | 7 | 13 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 17 |

"Has the school--at any time--developed an overall MUSE/IGE implementation timetable?"

Table I-4

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 26 -48 | 1 -12 | 3 -25 |
| NO | 28 -52 | 7 -88 | 9 -75 |

## Membership in Linkage Group

Table I-5

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| --Is school an active member of linkage group of schools? | YES | 38 | 70 | 7 88 | 8 67 |
| | NO | 14 | 26 | 1 12 | 4 33 |
| --(If YES), is this association generally of value to the school? | YES | 30 | -- | 5 -- | 7 -- |
| | NO | 8 | -- | 2 -- | 1 -- |

IIC

## Most Pressing Needs for Technical Assistance Reported by IIC's

Table I-6

| | | Installation Groups | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 9-71 + 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 | Total |
| | N's | 54 | 8 | 12 | 74 |
| A | More general help on IGE: how to implement | 9 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| | General school management, scheduling | 4 | 1 | | 5 |
| | Techniques for assessment, evaluation | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| | Group dynamics: how to work together | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | Record-keeping (on students) for IGE | 4 | 1 | | 5 |
| | Developing learning modules and units | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | Writing good instructional objectives | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| | How to group students for IGE instruction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| B | More TIME for IGE, unit leaders, planning, etc. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| | More aides (paid and/or volunteer) | 4 | 1 | | 5 |
| | More help from State Department, R & D | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| | Inservice and workshops | 3 | | 2 | 5 |
| | A model to visit and learn from | 3 | 1 | | 4 |
| | More personnel | 3 | | | 3 |
| | Developing materials | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| | Curriculum | | | 3 | 3 |
| A | How to use the learning center | | | | 2 |
| | Best organization of the IMC | | | | 1 |
| | How train personnel to manage the IMC | | | | 1 |
| | Help in establishing our long-range goals | | | | 1 |
| | How to integrate Kg and primary | | | | 1 |
| | How to multiage successfully | | | | 1 |
| | Cycling continuous teacher-training | | | | 2 |
| | Training for UL | | | | 1 |
| | How to report to parents | | | | 1 |
| | Integrating special teachers into IGE | | | | 2 |
| | Clarification of study skills materials | | | | 1 |
| | How best to utilize our space | | | | 1 |
| | Evaluating IGE teacher effectiveness | | | | 1 |
| | Better communication in the whole school | | | | 2 |
| | How to make our IIC active, effective | | | | 1 |
| B | How to duplicate testing materials | | | | 1 |
| | Better ways to disseminate materials | | | | 2 |
| | Cognitive Domain | | | | 1 |
| | How to check daily classwork | | | | 1 |
| | Motivation | | | | 1 |
| | Money | | | | 2 |
| | Space | | | | 2 |
| | How to use A-V equipment | | | | 2 |
| | Discipline | | | | 1 |
| | Need an SPC | | | | 1 |
| | We need a learning disability teacher | | | | 1 |

IIC

Unit Organization and Characteristics

Table I-7

| Response Category | | Installation Groups: 9-71 + 1-72 | 4-72 | 9-72 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N's | | 54 | 8 | 12 |
| | | N % | N % | N % |
| -- Do the units include all students in the school? | YES | 37-68* | 7-88 | 8-67 |
| | NO | 16-30 | 1-12 | 4-33 |
| -- Reasons for "exceptions" to full unitization: | | | | |
| Separate kindergarten program | | 7 | | 1 |
| Separate classes for Special Ed, EMR | | 1 | | 1 |
| Grades 4-5, 5-6, 6-8, not included | | 3 | | 1 |
| Grades 1-3 not included | | 3 | | |
| Combinations of the above | | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| -- Does any unit NOT have an IGE subject-area? | YES | 7-13 | 2-25 | 1- 8 |
| | NO | 46-85 | 6-75 | 11-92 |
| -- Number of units in school which appear to be multiaged (NONE = grade level units) | ALL | 42-78 | 8-100 | 9-75 |
| | SOME | 9-17 | | 1- 8 |
| | NONE | 3- 6 | | 2-17 |
| -- Is instruction for IGE subject(s) multiaged? (SOME = in some units) | YES | 39-72 | 6-75 | 9-75 |
| | NO | 3- 6 | 2-25 | 2-17 |
| | SOME | 12-22 | | 1- 8 |
| -- Is other regular instruction multiaged? | YES | 27-50 | 4-50 | 2-17 |
| | NO | 15-28 | 2-25 | 8-67 |
| | SOME | 12-22 | 2-25 | 2-17 |
| -- How many formalized IGE subjects, typically in the whole school? | 1 | 14-26 | 3-38 | 11-92 |
| | 1-2 | 6-11 | 1-12 | |
| | 2 | 17-31 | 2-25 | |
| | 2-3 | 4- 7 | 1-12 | |
| | 3 | 3- 6 | | 1- 8 |
| | 3-4 | 4- 7 | | |
| | 4 + | 6-11 | 1-12 | |

* In 3 schools, Special Ed-EMR is a unit; in 5, Kg is organized as a unit.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| -- Number of weekly unit meeting hours | Indefinite | | | |
| | 1 | | | 1- 8 |
| | 2 | | | 5-42 |
| | 3 | | | 3-25 |
| | 4 + | | | 3-25 |
| -- Unit meeting agenda typically prepared? | YES | | | 6-50 |
| | NO | | | 6-50 |
| -- Unit meetings sometimes for inservice in the unit? | YES | 40-74 | 7-88 | 8-67 |
| | NO | 13-24 | 1-12 | 4-33 |
| -- Do all unit teachers teach the IGE subject(s)? | YES | 46-85 | 8-100 | 11-92 |
| | NO | 8-14 | | 1-8 |
| -- Periodic assessment done by formal test techniques? | YES | 43-79 | 5-62 | 9-75 |
| | NO | 4- 7 | 3-38 | 3-25 |
| | SOME | 6-11 | | |

IIC

# IIC Summary Statement of 1972-73 Midyear Status

Table I-8

| | Groups | 9-71+1-72 | | | 4-72 | | | 9-72 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N's | 50 @ | | | 8 | | | 13 # | | |
| | | Yes | No | ? | Yes | No | ? | Yes | No | |
| 1. (a) | Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis? | 46 | 4 | | 7 | 1 | | 10 | 3 | - |
| (b) | Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program? | 42 | 3 | 5 | 7 | | 1 | 12 | 1 | |
| 2. (a) | Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material? | 24 | 23 | 3 | 6 | 2 | | 5 | 8 | * |
| (b) | Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers? | 23 | 22 | 4 | 5 | 3 | | 5 | 8 | * |
| 3. (a) | In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)? | 42 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 8 | 5 | |
| (b) | Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program? | 44 | 6 | | 8 | | | 10 | 3 | |
| 4. (a) | Are lines of communication in the school "open?" | 47 | 2 | 1 | 8 | | | 9 | 4 | - |
| (b) | Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal? | 45 | 3 | 1 | 7 | | 1 | 12 | 1 | - |
| 5. (a) | Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)? | 43 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 13 | | |
| (b) | Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children? | 41 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 3 | | 11 | 2 | * |
| 6. (a) | Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program? | 43 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 7 | 6 | |
| (b) | Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches? | 46 | 4 | | 8 | | | 10 | 3 | - |
| 7. (a) | Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time? | 50 | | | 8 | | | 13 | | - |
| (b) | Is it being implemented in <u>all</u> the units? | 44 | 5 | | 7 | 1 | | 11 | 2 | |
| (c) | Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject? | 37 | 13 | | 7 | 1 | | 10 | 3 | * |
| 8. (a) | In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching? | 46 | 2 | 1 | 8 | | | 10 | 3 | - |
| (b) | Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?" | 48 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | | 10 | 3 | - |
| 9. (a) | Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units? | 37 | 13 | | 8 | | | 9 | 4 | * |
| (b) | Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit? | 24 | 22 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | * |
| 10. (a) | Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model? | 43 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 1 | | 12 | 1 | |
| (b) | In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units? | 40 | 7 | 2 | 7 | | 1 | 6 | 7 | * |
| 11. (a) | On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure? | 44 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 1 | | 9 | 4 | |
| (b) | Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time? | 47 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | | 12 | 1 | - |
| 12. (a) | Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff? | 37 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 4 | | 8 | 5 | * |
| (b) | Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school since 6-72? | 42 | 8 | | 6 | 2 | | 11 | 2 | |
| (c) | Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance? | 43 | 7 | | 5 | 3 | | 12 | 1 | |

Table I-8

@ 4 IIC's omitted this item completely.
# Another IIC responded at last moment; data recorded for this item only.

# APPENDIX D

Tables for Comparison Group
of 1971-72/1972-73 Schools

Comparison

Table S-1

Number of Continuing Serious Implementation Problems
May 1972 vs Midyear 1972-73 for 43 Schools

| | May | Midyear |
|---|---|---|
| Ineffective leadership of some or all unit leaders | 11 | 12 |
| Confusion over roles and responsibilities | 17 | 11 |
| Teachers working too hard and long; "burn-out" | 20 | 17 |
| A sizable number of teachers not fully committed to MUSE and IGE | 2 | 6 |
| Availability of effective consulting assistance from outside the school | 14 | 9 |
| Resistance to idea of teaching multiage groups of students | 7 | 4 |
| Problems in teamwork, planning, & sharing within any or all units | 14 | 11 |
| Departmentalization of instruction in the units | 5 | 8 |
| Problems in communication in the school: between units; access to the principal; teachers and the IIC; staff meetings; attitudes | 10 | 4 |
| Problems in IMC: materials, staffing, space, and accessibility | 13 | 7 |
| Problems in in-service training: content, frequency, time, relevance | 19 | 12 |
| Competition among the units | 4 | 3 |
| Other | 8 | 11 |

Table S-2

Characteristics of the "Active IIC"
May 1972 vs Midyear 1972-73 for 43 schools

| | May | Midyear | | | May | Midyear | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | YES | NO | | NO | YES | NO |
| Regularly-scheduled meetings? | 42 | 40 | 2 | | 1 | - | 1 |
| Agenda regularly prepared? | 33 | 31 | 2 | | 10 | 6 | 4 |
| Formal log/minutes kept? | 26 | 22 | 4 | | 17 | 9 | 8 |
| Minutes distributed? | 27 | 22 | 5 | | 16 | 10 | 6 |

Comparison

Table S-3

IIC Summary of Implementation Status
(a) May 1972 Status, (b) May to Midyear Changes, and
(c) Midyear Balance of YES Responses

| | (a) May 1972 Status | | | (b) May to Midyear | (b) May to Midyear | (c) Midyear Balance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | P | NO to YES | YES to NO | YES's |
| 1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis? | 38 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 38 |
| (b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program? | 36 | 5 | | 5 | 2 | 39 |
| 2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material? | 18 | 23 | | 9 | 3 | 24 |
| (b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers? | 17 | 24 | | 11 | 4 | 24 |
| 3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)? | 31 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 37 |
| (b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program? | 39 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 39 |
| 4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?" | 40 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 39 |
| (b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal? | 40 | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 38 |
| 5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)? | 37 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 37 |
| (b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children? | 32 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 34 |
| 6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program? | 32 | 9 | | 8 | 4 | 36 |
| (b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches? | 38 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 39 |
| 7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time? | 38 | 3 | | 3 | - | 41 |
| (b) Is it being implemented in all the units? | 34 | 7 | | 5 | 1 | 38 |
| (c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject? | 26 | 13 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 28 |
| 8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching? | 40 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 40 |
| (b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?" | 38 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | 40 |
| 9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units? | 33 | 8 | | 3 | 4 | 32 |
| (b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit? | 21 | 20 | | 5 | 3 | 23 |
| 10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model? | 35 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 37 |
| (b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units? | 30 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 34 |
| 11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure? | 35 | 6 | | 4 | 1 | 38 |
| (b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time? | 37 | 4 | | 4 | - | 41 |
| 12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff? | 30 | 11 | | 6 | 5 | 31 |
| (b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school since 6-72? | 41 | - | | - | 3 | 38 |
| (c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance? | 38 | 3 | | 3 | 2 | 39 |

Table S-3

Comparison

Table S-4

Frequency Distributions (for 41 Schools)
of NO to YES and YES to NO Changes in Responses
to IIC Summary Questions on Status of Implementation
May 1972 vs Midyear 1972-73

| Number of Changes from NO to YES | Number of Changes from YES to NO | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 0 | 11 | 111 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 111 | 1111 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 2 | 1111 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 3 | | 1 | 11 | 11 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 4 | 11 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |